

Manatee County Public Schools

Buffalo Creek Middle School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	21
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	21

Buffalo Creek Middle School

7320 69TH ST E, Palmetto, FL 34221

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

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 Buffalo Creek Middle School is to inspire our students with a passion for learning, empowered to pursue their dreams confidently and creatively while contributing to our community, nation and world.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Buffalo Creek Middle School's vision is to establish and support standards of excellence that prepare students to become successful, well-rounded and involved citizens in the 21st Century.

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
Scarbrough, Brad	Principal	
Rainwater, Carrie	Assistant Principal	
	Assistant Principal	
Durst, Joanna	Teacher, K-12	
Baker, Joseph	Teacher, K-12	
Rodd, Katelyn	Teacher, K-12	

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.

Our Department Chairs along with representatives from all departments including ESE were invited to attend an Instructional Leadership Institute hosted by admin in June of this year. We reviewed data as well as broke down and revised our goals from last year.

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))

Progress monitoring occurs throughout the year.. We participate in both State and district PM. School leadership to include Department chairs continually monitor data and revise instructional practices as needed..

Demographic Data

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

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	40%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	48%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	TSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL)* Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	29	32	78	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	104	124	125	353	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	21	31	62	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	41	23	72	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	96	119	256	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	84	83	203	
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	1	2	3	

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	38	83	91	212

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	2	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	87	114	255	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	104	110	231	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	24	32	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	40	60	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	96	111	247	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	81	77	193	
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		

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	22	83	110	215	

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	2	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	87	114	255	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	104	110	231	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	24	32	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	40	60	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	96	111	247	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	81	77	193	
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		

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	22	83	110	215	

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	2	2
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*	49	47	49	52	49	50	52		
ELA Learning Gains				44			46		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				27			33		
Math Achievement*	61	61	56	60	35	36	60		
Math Learning Gains				50			43		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				47			41		
Science Achievement*	47	48	49	47	57	53	45		
Social Studies Achievement*	71	70	68	76	54	58	72		
Middle School Acceleration	74	81	73	74	47	49	74		
Graduation Rate					47	49			
College and Career Acceleration					76	70			
ELP Progress	35	34	40	28	79	76	32		

* 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)	TSI
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	337
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	51

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	505
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)**2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	19	Yes	4	4
ELL	28	Yes	4	1
AMI				
ASN	82			
BLK	41			
HSP	49			
MUL	57			
PAC				
WHT	66			
FRL	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%
SWD	30	Yes	3	3
ELL	32	Yes	3	
AMI				
ASN	73			
BLK	38	Yes	1	
HSP	42			

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	50			
PAC				
WHT	58			
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	49			61			47	71	74			35
SWD	16			24			5	30			4	
ELL	15			38			9	44			5	35
AMI												
ASN	77			77					92		3	
BLK	39			44			11	49	64		5	
HSP	36			54			38	65	67		6	36
MUL	49			59			38	83	55		5	
PAC												
WHT	54			66			55	76	77		5	
FRL	36			49			31	58	60		6	38

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	52	44	27	60	50	47	47	76	74			28
SWD	13	23	22	20	41	46	13	44	46			
ELL	19	28	24	34	45	47	12	55				28
AMI												
ASN	62	74		81	56		73		92			

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	27	34	23	34	52	47	29	55				
HSP	38	38	27	47	47	48	28	66	57			28
MUL	49	43	33	57	39	25	63	75	69			
PAC												
WHT	62	47	28	69	52	48	56	82	76			
FRL	38	38	26	45	45	42	35	62	70			21

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	52	46	33	60	43	41	45	72	74			32
SWD	18	30	26	22	34	32	13	34				
ELL	24	39	34	37	29	30	26	59	67			32
AMI												
ASN	73	57		83	57			92				
BLK	37	39	36	29	29	38	29	53	44			
HSP	34	36	29	43	36	35	29	63	62			32
MUL	46	44	31	59	48	44	38	58	92			
PAC												
WHT	62	51	34	72	47	47	54	80	79			
FRL	39	39	29	47	38	41	30	61	66			26

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2023 - Spring	42%	43%	-1%	47%	-5%
08	2023 - Spring	46%	45%	1%	47%	-1%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	53%	45%	8%	47%	6%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	63%	59%	4%	54%	9%
07	2023 - Spring	61%	58%	3%	48%	13%
08	2023 - Spring	44%	41%	3%	55%	-11%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	46%	45%	1%	44%	2%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	77%	58%	19%	50%	27%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	91%	56%	35%	48%	43%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	70%	69%	1%	66%	4%

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.

We saw drops in 7th grade ELA , Civics and Algebra. The curriculum shift may have contributed to our drop; however we were showing gains throughout the year. We will be monitoring this closely

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

There are two areas of concern which we continue to watch; 7th grade ELA and SWD. SWD has been below the federal index for 4 years, as a result we are closely monitoring their performance throughout the year during our PM's throughout the 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.

Our Algebra scores were significantly below our district middle comparison schools by 20%. Students were not enrolled into the ALEKS support class until the end of 1st quarter

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

Our 6th grade ELA and Math students had gains of 6% on average as compared to other district comparison models. Our ELL students were able to rise above the federal index. Additional supports through intensive classes using district provided instructional programs.

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

Our biggest area of concern would be the performance of our SWD sub group.

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

Overall literacy support for all students with a focus on vocabulary. Maintaining a focus on creating positive interactions with and among staff, Increased staff participation in PLC training.

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.

Build and nurture a culture that identifies the impact and value of literacy instruction for all content areas. Support educators with ongoing professional development to build competence and competency with literacy strategies. Implement strategies and best practices that support and develop student literacy achievement.

Level 1: Vocabulary

Level 2: Comprehension

Level 3: Writing

Measurable Outcome:

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

Increase students' academic vocabulary knowledge by 25% each quarter to support and develop student literacy achievement.

Monitoring:

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

Math – Quarter 1, Between August 14th and 18th

Science – Quarter 2, Between October 16th and 20th

Social Studies – Quarter 3, Between January 9th and 16th (Incorporates Return and MLK)

ELA – Quarter 4, Between March 18th and 22nd

*1st week of PD before school, Departments will discuss and create a list of ~25 words and definitions that will be included in the vocabulary assessment. Vocabulary assessments will contain no more than 100 vocabulary words and duplicate words will be eliminated.

*Electives will be aligned with correlating contents (ie. Tech/Engineering with math, Spanish with ELA, etc., and ESE will join these subject areas too). Core Contents will incorporate the words into their instruction due to some words having different meanings based on the subject matter. Each classroom will display a poster with the list of words on them.

*The vocabulary words will be highlighted on the morning announcements. The words will also be displayed in the hallways on the bulletin boards.

*Teachers will look ahead in their instruction to determine points where students will encounter the vocabulary list. Data chats will be held with students in regards to their individual and group progress.

*Students who earn 100% will receive individual awards/certificates. Possible incentives for students who score 100% would include display the students name

1st quarter reward- any student at 35% or higher (TBD by student leadership team)

2nd Quarter Rewards- any student who scores 65% or higher (TBD by student leadership team)

3rd quarter reward- any student who scores 90% or higher (TBD by student leadership team)

.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Joanna Durst (durstj@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.)

1. Facilitated, collaborative planning to increase teacher expertise of what students must know, understand, and be able to do aligned to the rigor required of the benchmarks and to plan instructional task that engage all students. Weekly collaborative planning will also address remedial and accelerated instruction for small groups and provide opportunities for problem-solving, discussion of high-effect practices, and ongoing review of student performance data.
2. Identify the instructional practice(s) that will increase teacher capacity and create a plan for coaching to accelerate improvement. Create systems for monitoring the focus, frequency, and types of coaching and support for improved teaching and learning.
3. Create a calendar of yearlong meeting structures (ILT, TCT, PLC, and IST) to analyze student performance data, define key attributes of learners to address their unique needs, and evaluate available resources best matched to students' needs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Our Literacy team believes that an overall focus on Literacy will have a positive impact on student ELA comprehension.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

1. Facilitated, collaborative planning to increase teacher expertise of what students must know, understand, and be able to do aligned to the rigor required of the benchmarks and to plan instructional task that engage all students. Weekly collaborative planning will also address remedial and accelerated instruction for small groups and provide opportunities for problem-solving, discussion of high-effect practices, and ongoing review of student performance data.
2. Identify the instructional practice(s) that will increase teacher capacity and create a plan for coaching to accelerate improvement. Create systems for monitoring the focus, frequency, and types of coaching and support for improved teaching and learning.
3. Create a calendar of yearlong meeting structures (ILT, TCT, PLC, and IST) to analyze student performance data, define key attributes of learners to address their unique needs, and evaluate available resources best matched to students' needs.

Person Responsible: Brad Scarbrough (scarbrob@manateeschools.net)

By When: August 2023

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

Our focus is to build capacity and understanding as it relates to using BEST instructional practices. Through building capacity and by providing tiered levels of support; we hope to increase retention by 50% as measured by overall turnover.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our Goal is to increase our sense of community and shared problem solving through focusing on student/adult relationships; leading to a decrease in overall discipline referrals and an increase in building security and trust as measured through climate surveys, Pre- and Post-.

Monitoring:

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

Follow-Up monthly and Quarterly through Climate surveys. (Literacy Team)

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Carrie Rainwater (rainwatc@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.)

- *. Lunch and Learns focused on Life Skills, Data Collection and Interpretation, AVID Strategies and student engagement.
- * Continuing development of Student Advisory Committee that will work with Admin to participate in problem solving components as they relate to school wide initiatives and discipline concerns. (R. Baker; Admin)
- *. Creation of a Staff Climate committee that will promote monthly opportunities for staff collaboration. (Rodd; teacher);
- * School Climate Surveys each semester (TBD; SEL Advisor);
- * An increase in Staff Appreciation as determined by the Student Advisory Board. (Rainwater; Admin);
- * Establish a behavior committee to incorporate Achieve/Champs model supporting teachers with classroom management strategies to improve student behavior in efforts to reduce student referrals and improve overall school climate. (J. Baker; Lead)
- * Implementation of the Districts Teacher Mentorship Program which will provide additional support to new educators (Durst and Moore, BCMS Mentor)
- * Increase in staff and student appreciation through monthly, quarterly and end of semester P.B.I.S. Initiatives (N. Fetzer; Staff), (J. Baker; students) (S. Daly, PBIS Coordinator)
- *Implementation of afterschool tutoring designed to provide additional support to the L25 students
- *Establish protocol norms for collaborative staff meetings that allow for respectful communication

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Through focused support being offered based on a tiered approach; we can build an internal structure where teachers receive continual support which will benefit overall culture and climate.

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.

Creation and Implementation of Student Advisory Committee

Person Responsible: Carrie Rainwater (rainwatc@manateeschools.net)

By When: September 30th, 2023

- *. Lunch and Learns focused on Life Skills, Data Collection and Interpretation, AVID Strategies and student engagement.
- * Continuing development of Student Advisory Committee that will work with Admin to participate in problem solving components as they relate to school wide initiatives and discipline concerns. (R. Baker; Admin)
- *. Creation of a Staff Climate committee that will promote monthly opportunities for staff collaboration. (Rodd; teacher);
- * School Climate Surveys each semester (TBD; SEL Advisor);
- * An increase in Staff Appreciation as determined by the Student Advisory Board. (Rainwater; Admin);
- * Establish a behavior committee to incorporate Achieve/Champs model supporting teachers with classroom management strategies to improve student behavior in efforts to reduce student referrals and improve overall school climate. (J. Baker; Lead)
- * Implementation of the Districts Teacher Mentorship Program which will provide additional support to new educators (Durst and Moore, BCMS Mentor)
- * Increase in staff and student appreciation through monthly, quarterly and end of semester P.B.I.S. Initiatives (N. Fetzer; Staff), (J. Baker; students) (S. Daly, PBIS Coordinator)
- *Implementation of afterschool tutoring designed to provide additional support to the L25 students
- *Establish protocol norms for collaborative staff meetings that allow for respectful communication

Person Responsible: Carrie Rainwater (rainwatc@manateeschools.net)

By When: September 2023

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

This group continues to be below the Federal Index; and has been so for the last 3 years.

Measurable Outcome:

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

With the implementation of the school wide literacy initiative ; that focuses on content specific vocabulary; we hope to see 25% improvement across PM ELA subgroups.

Monitoring:

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

This will be monitored by departments quarterly.

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.)

We will focus school wide on ELA initiatives through our Literacy initiative which focuses on Vocabulary.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

This is a part of a three year focus on Literacy development. Year 1 we are focusing school wide on content specific vocabulary .

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

We will focus school wide on ELA initiatives through our Literacy initiative which focuses on Vocabulary.

Person Responsible: Carrie Rainwater (rainwatc@manateeschools.net)

By When: September, 2023.

No description entered

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When:

No description entered

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When:

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).

CSI

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

ATSI

State funds are not provided to assist ATSI schools. However, local funds are provided to schools based on PPA in the School District of Manatee County (Mission Critical). These funds can be used and will be used to address areas of focus to support Federal Index Groups that are performing below 41% proficiency. Once schools are given an allocation school leadership team in collaboration with the Executive Directors of Elementary and Secondary review plans and ensure resources are used appropriately.

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: Positive Culture and Environment: Teacher Retention and Recruitment	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$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