

Manatee County Public Schools

# Braden River Middle School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>SIP Authority and Purpose</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>I. School Information</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>II. Needs Assessment/Data Review</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>III. Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>VI. Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus</b>	<b>0</b>

## Braden River Middle School

6215 RIVER CLUB BLVD, Bradenton, FL 34202

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

### 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.**

Braden River Middle School is an innovative community of engaged learners. We embrace the quest to use new ideas, model respectful behavior, and communicate effectively to create dynamic leaders.

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

Braden River Middle School is an exemplary student-focused school that develops lifelong learners to be globally competitive.

## 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
Zenon, Kimberlain	Principal	Oversee the overall academic, culture, climate, safety and security of the school.
Cucci, Kate	Assistant Principal	Assist the principal in maintaining the overall academic performance, culture, climate, safety and security of the school.
Baietto, Brad	Assistant Principal	Assist the principal in maintaining the overall academic performance, culture, climate, safety and security of 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 administrative team works closely with the Interdisciplinary leadership team to analyze and interpret school wide data. Schoolwide goals are created, drafted, and shared with the School Advisory Committee for review and approval.

**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 the primary artifact used to review data, set goals, and create action plans. The SIP is considered a living document and should be adjusted as needed to ensure continuous improvement for all learners.

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

<b>2023-24 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2022-23 Title I School Status</b>	No
<b>2022-23 Minority Rate</b>	60%
<b>2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b>	63%
<b>Charter School</b>	No
<b>RAISE School</b>	No
<b>ESSA Identification</b> *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
<b>Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)</b>	No
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL)* Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
<b>School Grades History</b> *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: B
<b>School Improvement Rating History</b>	
<b>DJJ Accountability Rating History</b>	

**Early Warning Systems**

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	53	73	163
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	40	40	116
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	44	39	38	121
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	70	77	192
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	60	87	186
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	51	69	161
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	18	20	49

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

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	1	6
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	5
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	12
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	13	19
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	38	75	84	197
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	65	67	172
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

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



**The number of students identified retained:**

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

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	1	6
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	5
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	12
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	13	19
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	38	75	84	197
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	65	67	172
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	18	20	49

**The number of students identified retained:**

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
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*	46	47	49	44	49	50	48		
ELA Learning Gains				40			45		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				33			38		
Math Achievement*	67	61	56	54	35	36	54		
Math Learning Gains				46			43		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				52			44		
Science Achievement*	38	48	49	41	57	53	41		
Social Studies Achievement*	67	70	68	72	54	58	64		
Middle School Acceleration	88	81	73	71	47	49	76		
Graduation Rate					47	49			
College and Career Acceleration					76	70			
ELP Progress	28	34	40	36	79	76	40		

\* 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	56
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	334
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

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

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	489
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
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	37	Yes	4	
ELL	43			
AMI				
ASN	77			
BLK	39	Yes	2	
HSP	48			
MUL	54			
PAC				
WHT	71			
FRL	49			

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	28	Yes	3	1
ELL	38	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN	72			
BLK	34	Yes	1	
HSP	45			

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	49			
PAC				
WHT	55			
FRL	42			

**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	46			67			38	67	88			28
SWD	13			31			13	36	92		5	
ELL	26			50			25	39	91		6	28
AMI												
ASN	65			89			53	82	94		5	
BLK	34			49			23	50			4	
HSP	37			58			24	59	81		6	28
MUL	50			70			38	56			4	
PAC												
WHT	55			76			52	78	93		5	
FRL	36			60			30	56	83		6	30

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	44	40	33	54	46	52	41	72	71			36
SWD	14	26	23	18	35	41	15	46	38			
ELL	23	38	40	37	46	51	10	56	41			36
AMI												
ASN	73	45		83	60		57	91	94			

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	29	31	36	47	40	12	54				
HSP	34	40	38	44	45	50	35	64	62			33
MUL	49	35		63	59		31	54				
PAC												
WHT	53	44	26	63	44	63	50	82	72			
FRL	35	36	27	45	44	50	33	62	64			28

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	48	45	38	54	43	44	41	64	76			40
SWD	17	34	31	30	43	44	8	29				
ELL	28	44	41	35	33	37	11	41				40
AMI												
ASN	84	77		82	63		71	93	94			
BLK	23	32	31	24	27	36	18	38				
HSP	33	38	34	40	36	37	19	53	65			30
MUL	54	44		58	51		47	71	54			
PAC												
WHT	59	49	49	68	49	62	54	74	80			
FRL	38	42	41	44	40	39	31	54	67			31

**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.

Grade	Year	ELA				
		School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2023 - Spring	43%	43%	0%	47%	-4%
08	2023 - Spring	40%	45%	-5%	47%	-7%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	45%	45%	0%	47%	-2%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	62%	59%	3%	54%	8%
07	2023 - Spring	67%	58%	9%	48%	19%
08	2023 - Spring	49%	41%	8%	55%	-6%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	36%	45%	-9%	44%	-8%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	93%	58%	35%	50%	43%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	92%	56%	36%	48%	44%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	66%	69%	-3%	66%	0%

### 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.**

2022-2023 Science data showed the lowest performance. As a whole, Science dropped from 41 to 38. There is a correlation between ELA and Science achievement for SWD (16 to 14), ELL (25 to 27) and FRL (35 to 31). BRMS Black/African American subgroup exemplified the largest proficiency gap of 34 to 24.

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

2022-2023 Social Studies data reflects a 7% decrease from 72-65%. There is a correlation between student ELA and Social Studies scores which could explain a decline. Students with disabilities struggled with ELA with a 16% achievement, SWD overall Social Studies was 38%. English Language Learners exhibited 25% ELA and 46% Social Studies proficiency level.

**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 shows the greatest gap when compared to the state average. The state of Florida shows 50% proficient, however, BRMS earned 45% making this the largest gap in comparison to the state.

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

Math showed the most improvement with a 16% increase from 54-70% achievement.

The math department focused on building and sustaining "Thinking Classrooms." By design, these classrooms offer greater opportunities to collaborate, problem solve and think through tasks. Student led data chats also created opportunities for students to become accountable for their growth.

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

Absentism is an area of concern for students across each grade level. EWS shows a total of 223 students at risk for attendance-absence. This is 30% of our school population and correlates with 32% of students at risk of course failure.

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

Raising schoolwide literacy is top priority for 2023-2024. Creating cross curricular opportunities for students to build and practice skills in reading, writing, listening and speaking is critical to increasing student achievement.

### **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.

English Language Arts (ELA) is our highest priority based on 2022-2023 data. There is a correlation between ELA and other content areas including Science and Civics due to the level of reading in both areas.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

By May of 2024, BRMS will increase ELA proficiency from 51% to 56% by implementing schoolwide SIOp professional development.

**Monitoring:**

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

This area of focus will be monitored through classroom walk throughs, progress monitoring data analysis and targeted interventions of support through MTSS.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Kate Cucci (cuccik@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.)

SIOp Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol is a research based model of sheltered instruction. It is a framework for planning and delivering instruction in content areas to strengthen their academic language and literacy skills.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

SIOp is supported through the SDMC and assists educators to design and deliver lessons that address the academic and linguistic needs for all students.

**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.

Elizabeth Maneeley will lead monthly SIOp professional development. Staff will read outlined text prior to monthly meeting.

**Person Responsible:** Kimberlain Zenon (zenonk@manateeschools.net)

**By When:** Once per month throughout duration of 23-24 school year.

The literacy team will work cohesively together with district support (Violeta Felix) to analyze and interpret reading data. Based on this information, the classroom teacher will work with Violeta and/or support staff



to create small group and/or individualized support for students who showcase a need for Tier 2 instructional support.

**Person Responsible:** Kate Cucci (cuccik@manateeschools.net)

**By When:** Once a month throughout the duration of the 23-24 school year.

Kate Cucci will identify students in need of T2 reading intervention. The MTSS team will analyze and interpret data to make informed decision of best practice for individual student or small group within the intensive reading class. The team will communicate with parents and provide updates using progress monitoring data.

**Person Responsible:** Kate Cucci (cuccik@manateeschools.net)

**By When:** Twice monthly throughout duration of 23-24 school year.

**#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.

SWD have consistently underperformed in comparison to their general education peers from 2021-2023.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

By May of 2024, 46% of Students with Disabilities at BRMS will increase student proficiency by scoring a level 3 on standardized assessments.

**Monitoring:**

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

The ESE team will spearhead annual IEP meetings and reevaluations as required by law. Additionally, ESE staff will review benchmark scores and progress monitoring data to ensure student plans are reflective of the needs of the student. Communication will be shared between ESE teachers via phone, email and FOCUS.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Brad Baietto (baiettob@manateeschools.net)

**Evidence-based Intervention:**

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

Evidence based intervention being utilized for serving/supporting SWD include Tier One CHAMPS behavioral management system. CHAMPS is used to ensure all students understand expectations ranging from conversation to movement to the end product. Positive Behavioral Interventions of Support are also used schoolwide. PBIS is an evidence based, tiered framework for supporting students' behavioral, academic, social, emotional, and mental health. Lastly, MTSS will be used to identify and support students with disabilities who continue to exhibit difficulty accessing proficiency.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

CHAMPS is a proven best practice to ensure all students understand classroom structure and expectations. Additionally, PBIS when used with fidelity improves social emotional competence, academic success, and overall school climate. MTSS is a proven framework to problem solve barriers that prevent student success. MTSS evaluates attendance, behavior and academic discrepancies.

**Tier of Evidence-based Intervention**

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

**Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?**

No

**Action Steps to Implement**

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

Schoolwide CHAMPS behavior management system  
 Schoolwide PBIS training, implementation and continuous communication/recognition  
 ESE Compliance (IEP meetings, reevaluations and proven levels of inclusive practices)

MTSS weekly MTSS/IST meetings to evaluate and identify trends relative to behavior, attendance and academics.

**Person Responsible:** Kate Cucci (cuccik@manateeschools.net)

**By When:** ESE and MTSS/IST compliance is ongoing throughout the school year. CHAMPS: implementation/sustainability three times per year PBIS Ongoing 2023-2024

**#3. 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.

2021-2022 data showed 36% English Language Learners met proficiency.

We initiated and sustained schoolwide SIOP training to address the achievement gap for our ELL population. Schoolwide implementation of SIOP and targeted support for our ELL population had a positive impact on overall ELL performance.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

By May of 2024, 50% of ELL will demonstrate proficiency as assessed by FAST assessment data.

**Monitoring:**

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

This area of focused will be closely monitored by the ESOL team. The ESOL team will work closely with student and family to alleviate barriers and support individualized goal. ESOL accommodations and supports are written plans and reviewed annually to ensure student success.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Kate Cucci (cuccik@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.)

Shelter Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) is considered a research based, best practice for developing language acquisition.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

SIOP is considered a best practice and facilitated at the district level to ensure schools have adequate levels of support to raise achievement for English Language Learners.

**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.

Targeted professional development for SIOP  
 Inclusive practices with classroom support through the ESOL department  
 Continuous review of students identified as ESOL Learners

**Person Responsible:** Kate Cucci (cuccik@manateeschools.net)

**By When:** SIOP Training ongoing throughout 2023-2024 school year. IPT and FAST testing will provide statistically evidence of the impact SIOP training has in regard to raising proficiency for our ELL population.

**#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.

BRMS Black/African American subgroup were identified in 2021-2022 as exemplifying a need for additional support within ELA, Mathematics and attendance as noted with only 34% of students meeting federal index. 2022-2023 goal was set to increase by 7%.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

2022-2023 data showed we met this goal with 41%, however, it is important to continue to improve to ensure our Black/African American population have ample opportunities to participate in accelerated coursework at BRMS.

By May of 2024, BRMS will increase Black/African American Federal Index from 41% to 46% by raising awareness to barriers that impact achievement, including attendance and/or disciplinary infractions resulting in loss of direct classroom instruction.

**Monitoring:**

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

MTSS will address specific needs of any student who has a loss of 5 days of direct classroom instruction as a result of disciplinary consequences.

MTSS Team includes: guidance, psychologist, social worker, attendance clerk, discipline dean and ESE Chair. This team will meet each week to discuss trends and individual needs of students as they arise. Each teammate plays an integral role in individual and schoolwide success.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Kate Cucci (cuccik@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.)

BRMS will use MTSS as a guide to monitor student success and alleviate barriers that prevent students from maximum student achievement. MTSS will meet each week to review attendance, behavior and achievement gaps throughout the school.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

MTSS is a federal mandate to ensure best practices and proven strategies are implemented to raise achievement and reduce undesirable behavior. Resources used for selecting this strategy include District professional development geared towards facilitating T1, T2, T3 systems of support.

**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.

The MTSS team will meet weekly to discuss barriers that negatively impact our learners. This includes attendance, discipline and overall achievement (D/F) reports.

The MTSS team will utilize standard protocols to support statistical needs of individual and school wide needs. These supports include:

Behavior: check in/check out, Life Skills training, mentorship opportunities through CDM, All Pro Dads, SPARKS and Sister Sowing Seeds.

Attendance:

Calls/emails/letters home to identify transportation challenges and support as needed.

Check in/check out to increase rapport and accountability.

Achievement:

Renaissance, Principal Award, Golden Panther, Green and Level Up Party, Zero's Are not Permitted "ZAP"

MTSS: Pull D/F report, credit recovery information

ESE to support teachers with accommodations and interventions as needed.

**Person Responsible:** Kate Cucci (cuccik@manateeschools.net)

**By When:** Ongoing throughout 2023-2024 school year. MTSS every Thursday (starting 8/17/23)

**#5. 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.

BRMS will focus on increasing student attendance as our primary area of focus. Failure to attend school negative impacts student academic success and overall well being.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

By the end of 2023-2024 school year, we would like to decrease the number of students missing 10 days or more unexcused absences to less than 10% of our student population.

**Monitoring:**

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

During weekly MTSS meetings, attendance will be an area of focus. Data will be pulled each week & reviewed by the team. Students who are at three unexcused absences are greater will receive interventions.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Kate Cucci (cuccik@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.)

Weekly data review. Phone calls to families of students who have missed more than three unexcused absences in one quarter.

Weekly attendance drawings for students who are in school every day for the previous week. This will make the reward more tangible for all students.

Attendance requirements have been added to eligibility for Renaissance, reward field trips and special awards.

Students approaching chronic attendance will have additional supports put in place by school social worker & MTSS team members.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Students who are in school have a greater opportunity for success. The strategies put in place are intended to encourage students to come to school and to make them feel as if they are a part of the Panther family.

**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.

Response to attendance concerns:

Patty Pearson will review attendance during weekly MTSS meetings.



From this discussion, the team will determine specific action plan for each individual student. Including but not limited to personal phone call, call out, letter and/or home visits.

**Person Responsible:** Kate Cucci (cuccik@manateeschools.net)

**By When:** Every Thursday from 2:00-3:00 throughout the duration of 2023-2024 school year.

Proactive approaches to raise student attendance:

1. Kate Cucci to pull weekly attendance data to celebrate students in 6th, 7th, 8th grade who had perfect attendance. Students are awarded PBIS points and/or small trinkets from the PBIS store. Student names are displayed in the cafeteria during each lunch.

**Person Responsible:** Kate Cucci (cuccik@manateeschools.net)

**By When:** Reports are pulled every Friday afternoon and shared by Ms. Zenon on Monday morning announcements. This will occur throughout the 2023-2024 school year.

The MTSS team created "we missed you notes" to distribute to all first period teachers. Teachers may use these notes to encourage a conversation with the student and/or potentially identify any issue relating to attendance.

**Person Responsible:** Kate Cucci (cuccik@manateeschools.net)

**By When:** Cards completed 8/2023 and will be used as needed by each first period teacher.

### 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).

School improvement allocations are based on needs. BRMS administrative team works with the school leadership team to evaluate data to identify areas that require additional support and/or resources. Admin and leadership team work cohesively together to create a plan to present to the School Advisory Committee.