

Manatee County Public Schools

Carlos E. Haile Middle School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	29

Carlos E. Haile Middle School

9501 FL 64, Bradenton, FL 34212

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

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 Carlos E. Haile Middle School to inspire our students with a passion for learning, empowering them to pursue their dreams confidently and creatively while contributing to our community, nation and world.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of the Manatee County School District 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
Nikitopoulos, Irene	Principal	ELA progress monitoring, professional development offerings, school grade monitoring, school culture
Sloman, Robert	Assistant Principal	Recruitment and retention, civics proficiency, master scheduling
Gerber, Bethany	Assistant Principal	SWD monitoring, science proficiency
Taylor, Elmina	Teacher, K-12	Math proficiency and gains
JONES, MATTHEW	Dean	Positive school culture, overall student achievement
Cox, John	Teacher, K-12	Social Studies, Pre-Advanced Placement

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.

Multiple stakeholders were actively involved in the development of the School Improvement Plan (SIP). Initially, a team of teacher leaders gathered in June to analyze results from the Spring administration of assessments and also reflect on the school culture, operational performance, and quality of instruction at

Haile Middle School. In June, several focus group meetings were held with representatives from the School Advisory Committee and Parent Teacher Organization. All stakeholders were encouraged to objectively reflect on the strengths and areas of development that needed to be addressed in the upcoming school year.

From there, trends in data and recurring themes were identified by administration and brought back to teacher leaders and School Advisory Committee members to formulate an action plan. Committees narrowed down actionable items to six goals that were formally brought before the School Advisory Committee for vote on August 15, 2023. After unanimous approval, these goals were presented to staff in August, 2023 and professional development, instructional initiatives, and budgeted funds were directed toward achieving these goals.

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))

Continual monitoring of the School Improvement Plan will be the responsibility of administration with support from the school's Instructional Leadership Team and School Advisory Committee. Teachers along with administration will track student progress using formative assessments and summative assessments offered by school, District and State assessments. Additionally, data from Tier 2 and Tier 3 intervention programs that target students with the greatest achievement gap will also be included to determine whether revisions to the plan are necessary. At monthly Instructional Leadership Team meetings, the school's leadership team will determine if progress is made toward these goals and adjustments, including spiraling instruction, pacing adjustment, schedule changes, and additional support, may be implemented. Progress updates will be presented to the School Advisory Committee and adjustments to the plan will be made, if necessary.

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	43%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	48%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP)

	Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 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	29	32	60	121	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	65	78	167	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	14	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	12	18	36	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	58	68	155	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	27	44	97	
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	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	26	47	60	133

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

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	74	68	72	214	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	77	78	84	239	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	11	19	42	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	7	8	20	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	58	72	56	186	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	56	54	50	160	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	4	
	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	64	65	71	200

The number of students identified retained:

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

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	74	68	72	214	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	77	78	84	239	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	11	19	42	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	7	8	20	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	58	72	56	186	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	56	54	50	160	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	4	
	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	64	65	71	200	

The number of students identified retained:

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

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*	54	47	49	55	49	50	64		
ELA Learning Gains				45			56		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				42			41		
Math Achievement*	76	61	56	69	35	36	71		
Math Learning Gains				54			61		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				40			54		
Science Achievement*	54	48	49	50	57	53	57		
Social Studies Achievement*	76	70	68	82	54	58	83		
Middle School Acceleration	82	81	73	79	47	49	75		
Graduation Rate					47	49			
College and Career Acceleration					76	70			
ELP Progress	38	34	40	75	79	76	68		

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	63
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	380
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	59
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	591
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	24	Yes	4	2
ELL	37	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN	85			
BLK	51			
HSP	53			
MUL	59			
PAC				

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%
WHT	74			
FRL	52			

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	23	Yes	3	1
ELL	43			
AMI				
ASN	78			
BLK	39	Yes	1	
HSP	51			
MUL	55			
PAC				
WHT	61			
FRL	49			

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	54			76			54	76	82			38
SWD	15			39			8	33			4	
ELL	27			54			8	58			5	38
AMI												
ASN	52			88			90	93	100		5	
BLK	45			62			20	75			4	
HSP	40			68			29	60	77		6	46

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
MUL	59			64			43	78	53		5	
PAC												
WHT	59			81			65	80	86		5	
FRL	44			63			33	66	73		6	33

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	55	45	42	69	54	40	50	82	79			75
SWD	8	28	25	19	36	29	11	29				
ELL	32	45	42	50	44	27	14	58				75
AMI												
ASN	82	61		91	74		70		92			
BLK	36	39	38	48	50	41	18	43				
HSP	42	42	40	58	43	31	35	76	66			78
MUL	46	49	43	72	55	30	47	82	70			
PAC												
WHT	61	44	46	74	57	44	58	87	81			
FRL	40	39	39	52	45	38	29	67	68			74

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	64	56	41	71	61	54	57	83	75			68
SWD	18	38	29	24	44	46	19	42				
ELL	44	58	45	59	71	71	13	68				68
AMI												
ASN	74	50		93	61		90	82	100			
BLK	46	58	40	43	46	32	33	76				
HSP	51	51	41	61	61	53	40	73	66			74
MUL	59	58	50	65	62	71	73	75	73			
PAC												
WHT	69	57	36	76	62	56	60	88	75			

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
FRL	49	48	41	54	54	52	41	77	57			67

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	54%	43%	11%	47%	7%
08	2023 - Spring	51%	45%	6%	47%	4%
06	2023 - Spring	47%	45%	2%	47%	0%

MATH

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	84%	59%	25%	54%	30%
07	2023 - Spring	73%	58%	15%	48%	25%
08	2023 - Spring	51%	41%	10%	55%	-4%

SCIENCE

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	53%	45%	8%	44%	9%

ALGEBRA

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	97%	58%	39%	50%	47%

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

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	75%	69%	6%	66%	9%

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.

The component that showed the lowest performance was English Language Arts (ELA) proficiency. Administration attributes that the factor that most contributed to this deficiency relates to the introduction of newly adopted instructional materials and programs implemented during the 22/23 school year. This included a new reading intervention program for Tier 2 and 3 instruction as well as a new textbook adoption for all grade levels. Teachers underwent training for these instructional programs; however, teachers noted that additional professional support would have benefitted instruction.

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

The Civics component showed the greatest decline from 82% in SY 21/22 to 75% in SY 22/23. Declines in this area could be attributed to fewer higher level 7th graders enrolled in Civics as compared to the previous 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.

No gaps existed among the school's components and the state average components

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

The area of the greatest improvement was proficiency in math. Actions that contributed to this improvement included fidelity to the learning program (Dreambox and Acaletics), collaboration among mathematics teachers (including Intensive Math), and push-in small group instruction.

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

A main area of concern is the number of students who scored a Level 1 in ELA. Low proficiency, as compared to the other subjects, remains a concern for our school. This information reveals that incoming 6th grade students need support in the area of Reading intervention. Also, the other area of concern is

the number of students who have failed a math course is slightly higher for students enrolled in the 23/24 school year as compared to the previous year. Another component would be to focus on gains in ELA and Math. Prior to the 22/23 school year, this component has continually fell below expectations. Instructional approaches during this school year will address this concern.

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

1. Increasing Proficiency in ELA
2. Improving School Culture and Increasing Enrollment
2. Focus on Gains in ELA and Math
3. SWD Subgroup Achievement
5. Increase Proficiency in Civics

Area of Focus

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

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

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

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

A decrease in school enrollment has occurred over the last five years from a high of 900 students in SY 19/20 to a current enrollment of 696 students. Much of the decrease can be attributed to higher performing students opting to attend nearby charter schools or other choice District schools. After interviewing several parent groups, initial feedback revealed that greater attention should be focused on academic excellence, rigorous instruction, and diverse course offerings. After discussing these results with the school's Instructional Leadership Team (ILT), an initial action plan to boost student enrollment was created. Proposals include offering a variety of elective options, increasing the number of high school courses and offering opportunities for gifted students. Further, school culture must be strengthened, and a strong message conveying academic excellence and school pride must be communicated to all stakeholders.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Through outreach programs, the expansion of elective choices and the implementation of rigorous course offerings, survey results measuring school culture will improve by 10 percentage points over the course of the school year.

Monitoring:

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

1. A "School Culture Committee" will be created and its focus will be to measure school climate, to increase student enrollment, and to develop an action plan to strengthen school culture.
2. The "School Culture Committee," working alongside the School District's Strategic Planning Department, will conduct school climate surveys three times during the year. Questions will be focus on stakeholders' perceptions of school/parent communication, class offerings, elective choices, student support and overall school culture. Stakeholders include students, parents, staff, and members of the community.
3. Survey results will be analyzed and the implementation plan will be adjusted to address deficiencies.
4. Enrollment numbers for the upcoming year will be monitored to determine the success of the action plan.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Robert Sloman (slomanr@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.)

Positive school culture measures that will be put in place include the following:

1. Increase communication to all stakeholders
2. Celebrations of success, both academic and behavioral
3. Increase academic and extracurricular options for students
4. Increase parental involvement in school decisions and event planning

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Countless research-based publications consistently conclude that a positive school culture yields an increase in student success. A positive culture can not only increase the number of students who choose to attend a particular school, but also can result in greater student achievement, improved teacher retention rates, and increased parental support.

1. Casas, Jimmy. Culturize. Dave Burgess Consulting, Incorporated, San Diego, California, 2017.
2. Stewart, Michael. Positive School Culture & Effective Leadership: Working Together for Great Results. 2017.

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.

Administration will analyze enrollment trends over the last several years and conduct interviews with stakeholders to determine reasons for declining enrollment. Data will also be analyzed as to where families have chosen to enroll.

Person Responsible: Robert Sloman (slomanr@manateeschools.net)

By When: August, 2023

A "School Culture Committee," composed of administration, teacher leaders, parents, students, and District representatives, will be created and its focus will be to measure school climate, to increase student enrollment, and to develop an action plan to strengthen school culture.

Person Responsible: Robert Sloman (slomanr@manateeschools.net)

By When: September, 2023

The "School Climate Committee" will develop climate surveys that will track indicators of school culture. The Action plan will be modified based on survey results.

Person Responsible: Robert Sloman (slomanr@manateeschools.net)

By When: September, 2023, January, 2024, and May, 2024

Climate survey results will be analyzed and enrollment numbers will be tracked. Action plan will be adjusted to address the needs identified through the surveys. Enrollment trends will be tracked.

Person Responsible: Irene Nikitopoulos (nikitopoulosi@manateeschools.net)

By When: Spring, 2024.

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

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

Reading proficiency remained the area with the lowest achievement level as indicated by the results of Haile's school grade calculation for the 22/23 school year. Only 50% of students at Haile Middle School were considered reading on grade level which is only slightly above the statewide average of 47%. This also was significantly lower than other top performing middle schools in the District which had proficiency scores above 60%. ELA proficiency was also significantly lower for the ELL, Hispanic, and SWD subgroups. Students who struggle in reading tend to score lower in other subject area assessments as reading is essential to mastery of civics, science, and math benchmarks, particularly as reading comprehension is necessary to successfully understand questions on these assessments.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By the end of the 23/24 school year, 56% of all students will be reading proficiently as measured by the Spring F.A.S.T. administration.

Monitoring:

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

1. Progress will be measured by analyzing results from Progress Monitoring assessments (F.A.S.T.) over the course of the school year. Additional progress monitoring data will be collected through formative and interim assessments administered through Lexia (Reading Intervention program), NoRedInk, and Study Sync (adopted ELA textbook series). Assessment results will be shared with students.
2. Administration and teachers will also monitor student mastery of standards with standards-based assessments that are developed collaboratively among teachers, administration and District personnel.
3. Data derived from these assessments will be analyzed for trends that indicate areas of strength and areas in need of remediation. Teachers will revise instructional plans based on this input.
4. Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions will be implemented in Intensive Reading courses and teachers will conduct monthly data chats with students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Irene Nikitopoulos (nikitopoulosi@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. Lexia Learning Reading Intervention Program, Noredink.com, Cengage ELA Textbook Series.
2. Student-teacher data chats
3. Rigorous reading and regular writing assignments will be embedded into ELA, Science, and Social Studies classes.
4. Teacher lesson planning PD during 1st and 2nd Semesters.
5. After school tutoring and reading "book club" sessions will be available to students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

According to FSU's Florida Center for Reading Research the "Lexia Power Up" program earned a "Strong" rating with a +36 average effect size.

Tiered interventions through the MTSS framework also provides opportunities for students who struggle in reading to receive the instructional tools needed for academic success.

Research-based instructional approaches will be based on the following text:

Fisher, Douglas, et al. Rigorous Reading: 5 Access Points for Comprehending Complex Texts. Corwin Literacy, 2018.

Fisher, Douglas, et al. Scaffolded Writing Instruction, Grades 3-8: Teaching with a Gradual-Release Framework. Corwin Literacy, 2007.

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.

Professional development in the areas of reading intervention strategies and writing across the curriculum will be provided to teachers throughout the year. Rigorous reading and regular writing assignments will be embedded into all grades as well as ELA, Reading, Science, Social Studies, Math and elective classes.

Person Responsible: Irene Nikitopoulos (nikitopoulosi@manateeschools.net)

By When: September, 2023

Ensure teacher lesson plans follow District pacing guides and curriculum maps, include high yield instructional approaches and assessments that track student progress. Lesson plans adjusted in response to data.

Person Responsible: Irene Nikitopoulos (nikitopoulosi@manateeschools.net)

By When: September, 2023

Before/After school tutoring for nonproficient students. Additional para support for nonproficient students.

Person Responsible: Irene Nikitopoulos (nikitopoulosi@manateeschools.net)

By When: September, 2023

Continue monitoring of school, District, and State progress monitoring data and adjust lessons, spiral instruction and implement intervention strategies in response to data.

Person Responsible: Irene Nikitopoulos (nikitopoulosi@manateeschools.net)

By When: September, 2023

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Social Studies**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 data from the Civics End-of-Course Exam, proficiency has decreased by 7 percentage points over the last two years (82% to 75%). The decrease may be attributed to the decline in reading proficiency which may have impacted students' abilities to master standards in the Civics curriculum. This year, reading interventions will be part of the instructional strategies used in Civics classrooms and Intensive Reading classes will incorporate reading passages that focus on Civics concepts to reinforce instruction.

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, 80% of all students will be considered proficient in Civics.

Monitoring:

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

1. During the school year, teachers and administrators will monitor formative assessments in the 7th Grade Advanced Civics classes as well as the 8th grade regular Civics classes.
2. Assessments will determine which standards are in need of review.
3. During quarter benchmark checks, administration and teachers will disaggregate the data to determine intervention strategies needed for specific students and classes for continued growth.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Robert Sloman (slomanr@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. Instructional materials include Gateway to Civics, Gale in Context, Vocabulary.com, iCivics, Civics 360. The Gateway series is "more closely aligned to Florida's instructional standards than any other resources available" according to the Florida Transformative Education website.
2. As recommended by the District's Instruction and Curriculum Department, Level 1 and Level 2 Students will take Civics in 8th grade.
3. As outlined by the District's adopted Decision Tree, students who struggle with reading will also be enrolled in an Intensive Reading Course.
4. Common planning and department meetings will ensure fidelity of standard based teaching.
5. Before/after school tutoring will be available to students..

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

1. District adopted curriculum provides interventions for Tier 2 and Tier 3 instruction.
2. 8th Grade Civics class will provide these students an extra year to develop reading skills as well as take a US History course that has Civics benchmarks embedded in the curriculum.
3. Intensive classes will support the students with reading comprehension and will include Civics themed passages.

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.

Administration will reach out to other schools with a similar demographics that achieved a higher success rate and assess other instructional approaches that may be incorporated into existing curriculum.

Person Responsible: Robert Sloman (slomanr@manateeschools.net)

By When: October, 2023

Ensure teacher lesson plans follow District pacing guides and curriculum maps, include high yield instructional approaches and assessments that track student progress. Lesson plans adjusted in response to data.

Person Responsible: Robert Sloman (slomanr@manateeschools.net)

By When: September, 2023

During quarter benchmark checks, administration and teachers will disaggregate the data to determine intervention strategies needed for specific students and classes for continued growth.

Person Responsible: Robert Sloman (slomanr@manateeschools.net)

By When: October, 2023 & December 2023

Reading interventions will be part of the instructional strategies used in Civics classrooms, and Intensive Reading classes will incorporate reading passages that focus on Civics concepts to reinforce instruction.

Person Responsible: Robert Sloman (slomanr@manateeschools.net)

By When: October, 2023

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science**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.

In SY 22/23, 55% of all 8th graders were considered proficient as measured by the 8th grade Statewide Science Assessment; however, this proved to be a school grade component that has seen a decline since seeing a 57% proficiency rate in 2021. Further, several subgroups scored well below the schoolwide average, including ELLs at 35%; SWD at 8%, Hispanic at 29%, Black/African American at 20% and FRL at 34%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By the end of the 23/24 school year, 57% of all students will be considered proficient in science as measured by the 8th grade Science assessment.

Monitoring:

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

Monitoring instructional practice to ensure that students master the 8th Grade NGSSS will occur through the following approaches:

1. Administration will monitor and provide feedback on weekly lesson plans to ensure alignment to NGSSS;
2. Administration will also ensure that 8th grade teachers collaborate with their 6th and 7th grade science counterparts to ensure that standards covered in previous years have been reviewed and mastered.
3. Administration will conduct informal walkthroughs on a weekly basis and provide teachers with immediate feedback regarding their instructional practice;
4. Administration will work with teachers to analyze progress monitoring data, intervention data and assessment data to track student progress. Feedback will be provided to students to track progress.
5. Administration and teacher leaders will continually review and analyze school data during leadership meetings and revise action plan in response to data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Bethany Gerber (gerberb@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.)

In addition to rigorous instruction and assignments in Science, 8th grade science students will use the following resources: Discovery Education Textbook, Gale in Context; Vocabulary.com; Gizmos; Guy Harvey, Generation Genius, and WozEd.

Tier 2 interventions include Progress Learning and will also offer formative assessments to track student progress.

Progress Learning Benchmark assessments conducted at the start of the year and at the beginning of 2nd semester will also be used to guide instructions.

This year, WozEd science kits with hands-on, experiential learning labs will be implemented for students to gain knowledge through the scientific process.

Administrators will use weekly lesson plans viewed in the classroom to monitor rigorous instruction and assignments as well as meet with the Science department to review data and progress throughout the year.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Progress Learning is a data-driven product helping students master Next Generation Sunshine State Standards (NGSSS). The inclusion of WozEd allows students to have immediate access to hands-on activities and labs that correspond to the standards being taught.

Discovery Education is "a research-backed, FSAS for Science-aligned, blended science curriculum custom built for Florida...grounded in the 5E instructional model (Engage, Explore, Explain, Elaborate, Evaluate)."

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 benchmark testing data with teachers and coordinate an action plan to spiral instruction to remediate standards where students struggled.

Person Responsible: Bethany Gerber (gerberb@manateeschools.net)

By When: September, 2023 January, 2024

Facilitate collaborative planning sessions among science teachers during 1st and 2nd semester and ensure that teachers use assessment data to guide instruction.

Person Responsible: Bethany Gerber (gerberb@manateeschools.net)

By When: September, 2023. January, 2024

Review weekly lessons plans to ensure that instructional materials are implemented with fidelity and lessons are consistent with curriculum maps and pacing guides.

Person Responsible: Bethany Gerber (gerberb@manateeschools.net)

By When: August 2023 - May, 2024

After reviewing and analyzing benchmark data, revise schoolwide action plan to include additional supports for science instruction if deemed necessary.

Person Responsible: Irene Nikitopoulos (nikitopoulosi@manateeschools.net)

By When: August 2023 - May, 2024

#5. 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.

ESSA Subgroup Data for the 22/23 school year showed that SWD students at Haile Middle School scored significantly below the total school population. SWDs comprise 13% of the total school population. Overall school grade was a 69% "A". In all areas (ELA, Math, Science, and Social Studies), SWD students had lower achievement scores and higher percentages of students with Level 1 and 2 results. The school grade for this population was a 25% or an "F". Data showed the following: 57% of SWD did not meet proficiency in Math; 85% of SWD did not meet proficiency in ELA.. The data showed that SWD students are lagging behind their peers in every tested area, with the largest discrepancies in Math and ELA. This achievement gap must decrease prior to students entering high school where they will otherwise run the risk of failing to meet graduation requirements.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By the end of the 2023 - 2024 school year, ratings for Students with Disability Subgroups will exceed 41% as measured by the Spring F.A.S.T. administration.

Monitoring:

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

1. Weekly checks on lesson plans and classroom walks by administration to ensure that pacing is appropriate and standards-based instruction is being implemented.
2. Monthly ILT and department meetings will include a review of both classroom assessment data, remediation data, if applicable, as well as District and State progress monitoring data.
3. District ESE Specialists will coordinate with administration, ESE Department chair, and teachers to suggest instructional shifts needed in response to data.
4. Students who failed to respond to interventions will be brought to the Intensive Support Team to determine the need for additional interventions.
5. Administration and ESE staff will monitor Early Warning Signs data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Irene Nikitopoulos (nikitopoulosi@manateeschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

The following resources will be used to support SWD:

1. No Red Ink; Gale in Context; Vocabulary.com; Lexia PowerUP; Big Ideas Intervention Resources; Acaletics; Dreambox; iCivics; Civics 360; Discovery Ed Experience; Gizmos; and, Progress Learning.
2. Additionally, SWD will be strategically scheduled according to their IEPs to have access to inclusion teachers. Other interventions and push in services will be provided as needed.
3. Learning Strategies classes will support students with Executive Function training, test taking strategies, and organizational skills as well as additional instructional support.
4. Tutoring will be provided to students as another layer of support.
5. MTSS regular review of students and support provided as needed.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Individualized instruction will increase student success and support.

Tiered interventions through the MTSS framework also provide opportunities for students who struggle in

reading and math to receive the remediation needed for academic success..

According to FSU's Florida Center for Reading Research the "Lexia Power Up" program earned a "Strong" rating with a +36 average effect size.

Dreambox Math is a research-based intervention program where students who use the program with fidelity have a 1.1 grade level increase according to their promotional material.

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.

Schedule students with disabilities into appropriate classes and ensure that instructional supports are provided as outlined by each student's IEP.

Person Responsible: Kimberly Carenza (carenzak@manateeschools.net)

By When: August, 2023

Communicate SWD list and accommodations to appropriate faculty and staff.

Person Responsible: Kimberly Carenza (carenzak@manateeschools.net)

By When: September, 2023

Strategic scheduling of students to meet IEP/inclusion plan and teachers for collaborative planning.

Person Responsible: Robert Sloman (slomanr@manateeschools.net)

By When: August, 2023

Ensure that case managers progress monitor students and that case managers collaborate with teachers regularly to discuss concerns.

Person Responsible: Kimberly Carenza (carenzak@manateeschools.net)

By When: Ongoing

Identify students for tutoring; plan and implement tutoring program.

Person Responsible: Kimberly Carenza (carenzak@manateeschools.net)

By When: October, 2023

Professional development and training for ESE staff as well as all faculty focused on improving student achievement for ESE students in core area instruction.

Person Responsible: Irene Nikitopoulos (nikitopoulosi@manateeschools.net)

By When: Ongoing

Coordinate with teachers and staff to identify students who may need additional/alternative support. Use MTSS framework through Intensive Support Team meetings to provide appropriate solutions.

Person Responsible: Bethany Gerber (gerberb@manateeschools.net)

By When: Ongoing

#6. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned Instruction**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

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

According to the most recent test scores, Haile Middle school ranked 4th out of all middle schools in the county by capturing a total of 345 points in the school grade calculations based on standardized state testing. This is a significant achievement; however, more can be done to meet the needs of all students. Over the past 4 years Haile has seen a decline in ELA and Social Studies achievement scores and has seen Science achievement scores remain stagnant. Achievement for ELA and Math among the lowest quartile declined between 2019 and 2022 as did learning gains for ELA and Math. These data provide a rationale for the significant need of increasing the quality instructional practice utilizing the B.E.S.T standards to meet the needs of all students at Haile.

To meet this goal, Haile will capture at least 65% of the available points or 587 points in the school grade calculation based on standardized state testing. This represents the percentage needed to be considered one of the top 3 middle schools in the county in 2022 when all components of the school grade including achievement, overall student growth and student growth in the L25 achievement categories. Particular attention will be placed on overall gains and gains in the L25 as measured by the Spring F.A.S.T. English Language Arts, F.A.S.T Mathematics, Algebra I EOC, and Geometry EOC.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Haile Middle School will rank in the top 3 middle schools in Manatee County as measured by the State's overall school grade.

Monitoring:

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

Haile will monitor instructional practice related to the B.E.S.T. standards through the following practices:

1. Administration will monitor and provide feedback on weekly lesson plans to ensure alignment to B.E.S.T. standards;
2. Administration will conduct informal walkthroughs on a weekly basis and provide teachers with immediate feedback regarding their instructional practice;
3. Administration and teacher leaders will analyze progress monitoring data, intervention data and assessment data to track student progress and provide feedback to teachers.
4. Administration and teacher leaders will continually review and analyze school data during leadership meetings and revise action plan in response to data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Irene Nikitopoulos (nikitopoulosi@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.)

Tier 2 and 3 interventions in Reading based on District's adopted Decision Tree (Lexia Learning, No Red Ink)

Tier 2 and 3 interventions in Math (Dreambox and Acaletics)

Instructional adjustments based on assessment results.

Before/After school tutoring for at-risk students.

MTSS for students who fail to response to Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

According to FSU's Florida Center for Reading Research the "Lexia Power Up" program earned a "Strong" rating with a +36 average effect size.

Dreambox Math is a research-based intervention program where students who use the program with fidelity have a 1.1 grade level increase according to their promotional material.

Tiered interventions through the MTSS framework also provides opportunities for students who struggle in reading and math to receive the remediation needed for academic success..

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.

Coordinate 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.

Person Responsible: Robert Sloman (slomanr@manateeschools.net)

By When: August, 2023

Define Look Fors related to high-quality instruction that are present every day, in every classroom, and for the benefit of every student. Create and use systems for monitoring Look-Fors to strengthen alignment of daily instructional tasks to grade level benchmarks, ensure fidelity use of instructional resources for remedial and intervention instruction, and utilize strategies to engage all students.

Person Responsible: Robert Sloman (slomanr@manateeschools.net)

By When: August, 2023

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.

Person Responsible: Robert Sloman (slomanr@manateeschools.net)

By When: September, 2023

Create a calendar of yearlong meeting structures (ILT, 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: Robert Sloman (slomanr@manateeschools.net)

By When: August, 2023

Implement a response to intervention framework (MTSS) to support students' academic and behavioral success.

Person Responsible: MATTHEW JONES (jones4m@manateeschools.net)

By When: August, 2023

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: Positive Culture and Environment: Other	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Social Studies	\$0.00
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	\$0.00
5	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
6	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Benchmark-aligned Instruction	\$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