Florine J Abel Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Florine J Abel Elementary School

7100 MADONNA PL, Sarasota, FL 34243

https://www.manateeschools.net/abel

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.

We will work together to build a positive school culture and provide the best instruction for our children.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Eagles Soaring to Success!

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
Webb, Samantha	Principal	Facilitate collaboration of SIP with all stakeholders, facilitate collaboration of school instructional focus areas and instructional strategies, facilitate collaborative data review, needs assessment, and action planning.
Moore, Jennifer	Assistant Principal	Assist principal with job duties and responsibilities
BURGARD, GWENN	Instructional Coach	Assist principal with job duties and responsibilities
SHAFFER, AMY	Instructional Media	Assist principal with job duties and responsibilities

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.

Facilitated collaborative development of the SIP with team leaders, grade level teams, SAC, and families. Met with specific teams (previously mentioned) to discuss focus areas for instruction based on current data, student needs/assessment data, and practices that support our needs using high effect size strategies (Hattie). Together, teams developed priority needs, goals, and action plan (including instructional strategies). Teams collaborated which high impact strategies would be implemented and developed 1-3 year phases based on specific strategies. With families and business partners, teams developed strategies to support learning and instruction in the homes/community. School based teams developed scope and sequence to support focus areas, including professional learning communities, data discussion cycles, instructional coaching opportunities.

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

The SIP will be monitored monthly during grade level instructional data analysis/action planning sessions and ongoing professional learning communities. Grade level data analysis sessions will analyze current grade level data (based on tier 1 school assessments) and make collaborative decisions on next steps for instructional strategies and practices. At the beginning of the year, grade level teams make proficiency and learning gains goals. These goals will be monitored monthly during grade level analysis/ action planning sessions. Professional learning communities, that occur three times a month, will support instructional strategies and practices. Including; evidence based research, demonstration via modeling/ micro PD, collaborative lesson planning, and practice/demonstration/feedback. Revision for the SIP will be ongoing, as it will always support the needs of the school via data analysis, student strengths, areas to strengthen.
Administration will meet after state/district assessments with grade level teams to do a deep dive analysis into the data-analyzing data by subgroup and priority subgroups that have the largest achievement gap (lowest quartile, student with disabilities).

Demographic Data	
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024	
2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	75%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: C

School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	5	3	1	2	3	0	0	0	14
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	29	23	30	15	11	0	0	0	108
Course failure in Math	0	31	19	19	16	13	0	0	0	98
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	15	11	0	0	0	32
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	16	13	0	0	0	29
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	29	23	30	15	11	0	0	0	108

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	5	3	1	2	3	0	0	0	14

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	6	0	0	0	0	0	6
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	7	12	16	10	7	3	0	0	0	55
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	12	18	22	0	0	0	52
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	9	23	14	0	0	0	46
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	12	18	22	0	0	0	52
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	9	23	14	0	0	0	46
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	17	18	29	13	19	0	0	0	96

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	6	5	12	13	19	0	0	0	55

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	12
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)
Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	7	12	16	10	7	3	0	0	0	55
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	12	18	22	0	0	0	52
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	9	23	14	0	0	0	46
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	12	18	22	0	0	0	52
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	9	23	14	0	0	0	46
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	17	18	29	13	19	0	0	0	96

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	6	5	12	13	19	0	0	0	55

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
				Grade Level						
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	12
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	50	51	53	41	55	56	37		
ELA Learning Gains				60			43		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				55			40		
Math Achievement*	57	62	59	52	50	50	58		
Math Learning Gains				68			75		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				67			71		
Science Achievement*	48	51	54	46	65	59	46		
Social Studies Achievement*					66	64			
Middle School Acceleration					51	52			
Graduation Rate					52	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	55	59	59	57			61		

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	53
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	265
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	56
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	446
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	26	Yes	2	1
ELL	37	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	55			
HSP	48			
MUL	64			
PAC				
WHT	61			

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%
FRL	51			

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	37	Yes	1	
ELL	45			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	49			
HSP	54			
MUL	50			
PAC				
WHT	69			
FRL	52			

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	50			57			48					55
SWD	19			43			15				4	
ELL	26			42			27				5	55
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	53			53							3	
HSP	43			51			33				5	53
MUL	60			67							2	

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
2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
PAC												
WHT	58			65			71				4	
FRL	49			55			45				5	50

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
2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
All Students	41	60	55	52	68	67	46					57
SWD	18	37	40	26	52	58	33					33
ELL	35	50		40	50		36					57
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	30	59		35	73							
HSP	38	55	53	46	61	69	47					59
MUL	36			64								
PAC												
WHT	53	72		71	88		62					
FRL	38	55	48	48	68	68	44					50

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
2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
All Students	37	43	40	58	75	71	46					61
SWD	12	35	18	25	57	58	21					63
ELL	27	33	33	54	81		28					61
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	30	50		50	58		42					
HSP	38	36	31	58	76	58	42					64
MUL	33			82								
PAC												
WHT	44	43		61	79		54					
FRL	34	42	39	52	79	74	41					56

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)
The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.
The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	43%	53%	-10%	54%	-11%
04	2023 - Spring	50%	54%	-4%	58%	-8%
03	2023 - Spring	48%	47%	1%	50%	-2%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	57%	62%	-5%	59%	-2%
04	2023 - Spring	55%	64%	-9%	61%	-6%
05	2023 - Spring	51%	61%	-10%	55%	-4%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	46%	49%	-3%	51%	-5%

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.

Data from the 21.22 school year the showed the lowest performance was math learning gains (17% decrease), math proficiency (6% decrease), and math L25 learning gains (4% decrease). Contributing factors would teacher retention (six instructional positions in grades 3-5 resigned that year following COVID), resulting in low instructional quality (substitutes), lack of understanding of instructional content and pedagogy (substitutes), and lack of administrative personnel to support (instructional coach, media specialist) to support learning in the classrooms and provide instructional support.

Current school data from the 22.23 school year showed lowest performance gain was 5th grade science. Science had a two percent increase from the year prior (ELA; 10% gain, Math; 7% gain). Contributing

factors for minimal gain in science would include teacher development and understanding of science standards and item specifications, few opportunities for continuous spiral review of science vocabulary and standards, minimal opportunities for multi-sensory instruction, increased opportunities for science instruction during the day.

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

21.22 School Year:
Data from the 21.22 school year the showed greatest declines were math learning gains (17% decrease), math proficiency (6% decrease), and math L25 learning gains (4% decrease). Resulting factors include high teacher resignation in intermediate grades, vacant position for instructional coach and media specialist (both positions support teaching/learning in the classroom).

22.23 School Year:
Based on current school data, there was no decline in data (ELA; 10% gain, Math; 7% gain, Science; 2% gain) and data represents highest proficiency for the school over the last eight years.

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.

21.22 School Year:
Data from the 21.22 school year the showed greatest declines were math learning gains (17% decrease), math proficiency (6% decrease), and math L25 learning gains (4% decrease). Resulting factors include high teacher resignation in intermediate grades, vacant position for instructional coach and media specialist (both positions support teaching/learning in the classroom).

22.23 School Year:
Based on current school data, there was no decline in data (ELA; 10% gain, Math; 7% gain, Science; 2% gain) and data represents highest proficiency for the school over the last eight years.

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

21.22
Data components that showed greatest improvement were ELA learning gains (17% gain), ELA L25 learning gains (15%), followed by ELA proficiency (4% gain). Instructional action steps implemented to increase data in ELA was Teacher Clarity; Success Criteria in ELA (phase 1), Instructional support for ELA in grades 4/5.

22.23
Based on current school data, data components that showed the greatest improvement were reading proficiency (10% gain), math proficiency (7% gain), and science (2% gain). Instructional action steps included weekly professional learning communities focused on school wide instructional strategies; Teaching with Clarity; Success Criteria for ELA, daily formative assessments for ELA, daily written response prompts for ELA, and daily implementation of Thinking Maps. PLCS focused on providing evidence based research, demonstration/micro PD sessions, collaborative lesson development sessions, and team demonstration/post feedback sessions. Teams met monthly for grade level data analysis and action planning based on tier 1 assessments (3rd-5th ORF & BEST Benchmarks comprehension assessments).

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

One concern after analyzing the early warning systems for grades K-5, is the number of students in grades K-2 that have substantial reading deficiencies. It is imperative that we collect and analyze tier 1 grade level data on a monthly basis for primary grades, followed by collaborative action planning for instruction to strengthen student proficiency. Data analysis will focus on Kindergarten; letter/sound proficiency, DOLCH sight word accuracy, non sense word accuracy. 1st grade data focused on DOLCH sight word accuracy, non sense word accuracy, oral reading fluency accuracy. 2nd grade data focused on oral reading fluency accuracy and BEST benchmarks proficiency.

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

1. Increase math learning gains
2. Increase math L25 learning gains
3. Increase math proficiency
4. Increase science proficiency
5. Increase ELA L25 learning gains

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 Math

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.

School wide implementation of high effect size practices for math to include; Teaching with Clarity; Success Criteria, daily formative assessments mirroring rigor of benchmark item specifications, daily opportunities critical thinking through written response, monthly data analysis and action planning on cumulative taught math benchmarks with daily opportunities for spiral review and item feedback.

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

By implementation of core Tier 1 instructional math practices, math proficiency in grades K-2 will increase by 12%, from 48 to 60%, as measured by 22.23 FAST PM3 compared to 23.24 FAST PM 3.

By implementation of core Tier 1 instructional math practices, math proficiency in grades 3-5 will increase by 16%, from 59 to 75%, as measured by 22.23 FAST PM3 compared to 23.24 FAST PM 3.

By implementation of core instructional math practices, math learning gains in grades 3-5 will increase by 17%, from 58 to 75%, as measured by 21.22 FSA compared to 23.24 FAST PM 3.

By implementation of core instructional math practices, math L25 learning gains in grades 3-5 will increase by 8%, from 67 to 75%, as measured by 21.22 FSA compared to 23.24 FAST PM 3.

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

Systems for monitoring high-quality instruction include; facilitated, collaborative planning, ongoing classroom observations with feedback/coaching, routine use of use of student performance data to make instructional decisions, ongoing grade level meetings, and multi-tiered system of support Grade level teams will assess students monthly on math benchmarks that have been previously taught (cumulative assessment). Teams and administration will meet monthly to analyze BEST benchmark data and develop action steps for instruction, including daily targeted review of benchmarks that have low mastery/proficiency.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Samantha Webb (webbs@manateeschools.net)

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

Florida's Multi-Tiered Systems of Support

Teaching with Clarity; Success Criteria (Hattie; 0.75 effect size)
Daily Formative Assessments with Instructional Feedback (Hattie; 048 & 0.70 effect size)
Daily opportunities for critical thinking through Writing in Response prompts (Hattie; 0.79 effect size)

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

An effective MTSS framework has the following components; strong, high quality classroom instruction for all students, use of assessment data to measure and monitor academic/behavior progress, identification of at risk students, targeted, evidenced based interventions, and routine collaboration of school teams to determine when and where coaching and raining are needed for improved learning outcomes.

Evidence based instructional practices/interventions selected were based on the effect size of the practice (supported by John Hattie's research). These practices had the highest effect sizes and had the highest relevance to support our school's needs (based on qualitative/quantitative data).

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.

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 tasks that engage all students. 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.

Define Look Fors related to high-quality instruction that are present every day, in every classroom, and for the benefit of every students. 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. Daily Implementation of Success Criteria, formative assessments/feedback, writing in response.

Identify the instructional practices that will increase teacher capacity and create a plan for coaching to accelerate improvement.

Person Responsible: Samantha Webb (webbs@manateeschools.net)

By When: By the end of quarter 1

Monthly data analysis and action planning on tier 1 math data. Action planning to include development of daily BEST benchmark review (rigor matching item specifications) based on data analysis. Looks like: 20 minutes per day focused on Benchmarks that were not mastered (organized by math categories).

Person Responsible: Samantha Webb (webbs@manateeschools.net)

By When: By the end of quarter 1, full implementation of action steps

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

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

Area of focus to support a positive culture and environment, is increasing attendance for students that are chronically absent, via our early warning systems and identification of tiered interventions for attendance.

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

By May, 2024, students that were identified as chronically absent via early warning systems and tiered interventions, will decrease their absences by 50%.

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

Systems for monitoring student attendance include multi-tiered system of support to received tiered interventions, and regular team meetings with IST, to monitor progress toward improvement in attendance.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Samantha Webb (webbs@manateeschools.net)

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

Florida's Multi-Tiered System of Support

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

An effective MTSS framework has the following components; strong, high quality classroom expectations for all students, use of attendance data to measure and monitor progress, identification of at risk students, targeted, evidenced based interventions, and routine collaboration of school teams to determine when and where coaching and training are needed for improving learning outcomes.

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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

Facilitated, collaborative meetings (IST and grade level) to increase teacher capacity for students that are chronically absent and strategies to increase attendance. Teams will meet to develop tiered interventions for attendance and monitor progress.

Person Responsible: Samantha Webb (webbs@manateeschools.net)

By When: By the end of the first month of school, students with chronic absenteeism will be identified, communication will occur with families, and interventions with progress monitoring will be implemented.

#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.

Our ESSA subgroup, students with disabilities, has not met the 41% learning gains threshold, therefore this subgroup is not making adequate progress. It is imperative that all subgroups, resulting in all students, make yearly learning progress.

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

If Tier 1 instruction is aligned to the rigor of our benchmarks, with scaffolding and learning techniques applied strategically to support our students with disabilities, then our ESSA subgroup, Student with Disabilities, will have at least 80% of students making learning gains in reading and math. The aim is to effectively provide support though additional small group instruction to close the achievement gap for our SWD subgroup.

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

Systems for monitoring high quality support for our students with disabilities subgroup include 1) routine use of performance data to ensure students with disabilities are achieving adequate learning gains 2) Multi-tiered systems of support for interventions in both reading and math and 3) strategies planning and support for additional small group instruction

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Samantha Webb (webbs@manateeschools.net)

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

Florida's Multi-Tiered System of Support
Direct Instruction
Scaffolding

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

An effective MTSS framework ensures that there is strong high quality classroom instruction for all students with the use of assessment data to measure and monitor academic progress.
Direct Instruction & scaffolding (specifically in small group instruction for our SWD subgroup) have high impact effect sizes as researched by John Hattie (Direct Instruction 0.59 effect size & Scaffolding 0.82 effect size)

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 direct instruction and scaffolding strategies for what students must know, understand, and be able to do aligned to the rigor of the benchmarks. Weekly collaborative planning will address remedial (or accelerated) instruction in addition to the core instruction being taught.

2) Small group instruction for SWD in grades 3-5 will be provided for reading and math, focusing on scaffolding strategies and additional direct instruction.

3) Monthly data analysis and action planning for our SWD subgroup will occur with administration, coaches, and teachers. Data chats will focus on proficiency and learning gains met by SWD subgroup and next steps for direct instruction and scaffolding.

Person Responsible: Samantha Webb (webbs@manateeschools.net)

By When: By end of May, 2024.

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).

All funding allocations will 1) comply with state guidelines and recommendations to increase student academic proficiency and 2) be developed collaboratively with key stakeholders to ensure allocations target priority needs.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale
Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Students in grades K-2 will receive direct and explicit instruction in phonic, supported by BEST benchmarks, as well as daily opportunities for strategic repeated reading to increase letter/sound accuracy, nonsense word accuracy, and oral reading fluency. Additional opportunities for targeted small group instruction, focused on response to intervention, will occur daily with instruction provided by a

reading endorsed teacher. Teachers will implement daily tier 1 practices for math and reading; Teaching with Clarity, Thinking Maps, Formative Assessments/feedback, and writing in response (summaries).

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

Students in grades 3-5 will receive direct and explicit instruction in comprehension, supported by BEST benchmarks, as well as daily opportunities for strategic repeated reading to increase oral reading fluency, thus leading to increased comprehension text. Additional opportunities for targeted small group instruction, focused on response to intervention, will occur daily with instruction provided by a reading endorsed teacher. Teachers will implement daily tier 1 practices for math and reading; Teaching with Clarity, Thinking Maps, Formative Assessments/feedback, and writing in response (summaries).

Measurable Outcomes
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data-based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- ◦ Each grade K -3, using the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment;

- ◦ Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a Level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment; and

- ◦ Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

As measured by 2023 ELA & Math Spring FAST, 50% of students in grades K-2, will perform on grade level.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

As measured by 2023 ELA Spring FAST, 60% of students in grades 3-5, will score a level 3 or higher.
As measured by 2023 ELA Spring FAST, 75% of students in grades 3-5, will increase learning gains levels.
As measured by 2023 ELA Spring FAST, 75% of students performing in the lowest quartile, in grades 3-5, will increase learning gains levels.

As measured by 2023 Math Spring FAST, 75% of students in grades 3-5, will score a level 3 or higher.
As measured by 2023 Math Spring FAST, 75% of students in grades 3-5, will increase learning gains levels.
As measured by 2023 Math Spring FAST, 75% of students performing in the lowest quartile, in grades 3-5, will increase learning gains levels.

Monitoring

Monitoring
Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

Systems for monitoring high quality instruction include; facilitated and collaborative planning focused on BEST benchmarks for ELA and math, ongoing qualitative data through classroom observations/walk throughs with targeted feedback and coaching opportunities, ongoing data analysis and instructional action planning using tier 1 school assessments and district/state assessments, multi-tiered system of

support to support instruction in response to intervention, ongoing team meetings such as ILT and PLCS to monitor progress toward school improvement.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Webb, Samantha, webbs@manateeschools.net

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:
Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Facilitated, collaborative planning to increase teacher pedagogy, focused on high effect size practices (Teaching with Clarity, Thinking Maps, Formative Assessments/Feedback, Writing in Response/ Summaries, Classroom Discussion/Jigsaw, Response to Intervention), and ongoing review of student performance data and action planning. Teachers will use Decision-Tree instructional materials, including Benchmark Advance, Lexia CORE, SRA, and/or SIPPS to ensure explicit and rigorous instruction for tier 1 instruction and intervention.

Rationale:
Explain the rationale for selecting practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

The purpose of planning, implementing, and monitoring responsive instruction is to ensure the progression of student learning and increase grade level literacy and math proficiency. Effectively delivered core, remedial, and intervention instruction will move students along the trajectory toward proficiency. The Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading plan, Decision-Tree, and Literacy Leadership Teams will provide guidance on intervention and instruction.

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- ◦ Literacy Leadership

- ◦ Literacy Coaching

- ◦ Assessment

- ◦ Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
All action steps for Benchmark-aligned instruction also apply to the RAISE Area of Focus, specifically strengthening systems to monitor Tier 1 instruction and building teacher capacity through coaching for accelerated improvement. School teams will participate in and implement the professional development provided by the State Regional Literacy Directors of improve early literacy instruction. The instructional coach will participate in monthly coaches' academy aligned to the BSI Coaching for Accelerated Improvement.	Webb, Samantha, webbs@manateeschools.net

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements
This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))
List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

Our SIP will be developed with stakeholder input from the end of the last school year, and will be revised with any input from the SAC for the current school year, as well as meeting with grade level teams to gain input. Progress on our SIP plan will be shared by the following; SAC/Family Meetings (4x year-including input on SIP), District Connect Ed messages, School based DOJO messages, webpage. Webpage: https://www.manateeschools.net/abel

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.
List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

Our school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and community stakeholders (that fulfill our vision/mission) but constant communication on academic expectations (and individual student progress), school wide events including family nights, SAC/Family meetings, parent information

sessions, and more. We will also support families with uniforms for families that are Project Heart (Homeless) or for families going through financial transitions. We partner with community organizations to ensure that students that don't have access to food over the weekend, receive weekend food bags. Webpage: https://www.manateeschools.net/abel

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii))

Academic proficiency will be strengthened and will increase in both reading and math, by strengthening tier 1 practices and our MTSS interventions/small groups. We plan to increase proficiency in both reading and math by facilitated collaborative planning (focused on BEST Benchmarks), ensuring that students in grades K-5 have opportunities for accelerated reading and math instruction, implementing professional learning communities where teachers and admin/instructional coach meet weekly to strengthen tier 1 instruction, ongoing data analysis and action planning with teachers monthly, and MTSS.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

Project Heart (Homeless Act)
ESOL program

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan
Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

NA

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

NA

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

. NA

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

NA

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

NA

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: Math	$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	$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