

Manatee County Public Schools

G D Rogers Garden Bullock Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| SIP Authority and Purpose | 3 |
| I. School Information | 6 |
| II. Needs Assessment/Data Review | 10 |
| III. Planning for Improvement | 14 |
| IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review | 0 |
| V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence | 24 |
| VI. Title I Requirements | 27 |
| VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus | 29 |

G D Rogers Garden Bullock Elementary

515 13TH AVE W, Bradenton, FL 34205

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

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.

District Mission Statement:

Manatee County Public Schools will educate and develop all students today for their success tomorrow.

Rogers Garden-Bullock Mission Statement:

We are committed to academic excellence and equity for every student in every classroom every day to ensure their success.

By June 2024, 50% of the students will score satisfactory in ELA, Mathematics and Science measured by state assessments through grade level standard based learning experiences.

Provide the school's vision statement.

District Vision Statement:

Manatee County Public Schools will be an exemplary student-focused school system that develops lifelong learners to be globally competitive.

Rogers Garden-Bullock Vision Statement

Our students will be successful in both academics and behavior, so they create and accomplish goals for their future.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|-------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------|
| Escorcia, Michael | Principal | |
| Britto, Rebecca | Assistant Principal | |
| Keats, Krista | Assistant Principal | |
| English, Cristen | Instructional Coach | |
| Aviertt, Kristina | Dean | |
| keller, Erika | Dean | |

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.

During our SAC meetings we bring various school related items to discuss and get feedback and input from our stakeholders (Parents, community members, staff, and business partners). This feedback and

input is used to make decisions that help support the goals and areas of Focus outlined by our SIP. We get input on how effective our strategies are to help meet our SIP goals, and we also get suggestions on what needs to be done help overcome any barriers that are affecting us reaching those 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))

We process monitor monthly with every grade level at Teacher Collaborative Team Meetings (TCT's) where they discuss the needs of our students and how we plan to support them. We also have weekly Instructional Leadership Meetings (ILT) and weekly collaborative planning sessions with our teachers to ensure that our students are getting the best instructional practices to help meet those grade level academic standards. Within those meetings we will analyze our progress and make any needed improvements to help meet those goals set by our SIP plan. We will review and analyze our data to help set new goals and actions plans to support the succes of our students.

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 | 93% |
| 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: C 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: D |
| School Improvement Rating History | |

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Absent 10% or more days | 25 | 38 | 31 | 35 | 33 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 199 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 2 | 7 | 8 | 45 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 94 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 17 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 15 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 64 | 33 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 130 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 44 | 36 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 112 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 64 | 33 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 130 |
| | 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 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 15 | 19 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 45 |

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 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 |
| 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 | 25 | 38 | 31 | 35 | 33 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 199 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 2 | 7 | 8 | 45 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 94 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 17 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 15 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 64 | 33 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 130 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 44 | 36 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 112 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 64 | 33 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 130 |
| | 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 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 15 | 19 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 45 |

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 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 |
| 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* | 25 | 51 | 53 | 27 | 55 | 56 | 27 | | |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 50 | | | 45 | | |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 64 | | | 56 | | |
| Math Achievement* | 43 | 62 | 59 | 41 | 50 | 50 | 31 | | |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 65 | | | 26 | | |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 53 | | | 22 | | |
| Science Achievement* | 24 | 51 | 54 | 27 | 65 | 59 | 19 | | |
| Social Studies Achievement* | | | | | 66 | 64 | | | |
| Middle School Acceleration | | | | | 51 | 52 | | | |
| Graduation Rate | | | | | 52 | 50 | | | |
| College and Career Acceleration | | | | | | 80 | | | |
| ELP Progress | 63 | 59 | 59 | 57 | | | 56 | | |

* 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 | 35 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | Yes |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 6 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 176 |
| 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 | 48 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 2 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 384 |
| 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 | 17 | Yes | 2 | 2 |
| ELL | 37 | Yes | 1 | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | 24 | Yes | 1 | 1 |
| HSP | 35 | Yes | 1 | |
| MUL | 50 | | | |
| 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 | 35 | Yes | 2 | |
| FRL | 34 | Yes | 1 | |

| 2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY | | | | |
|------------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|---|---|
| ESSA Subgroup | Federal Percent of Points Index | Subgroup Below 41% | Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41% | Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32% |
| SWD | 30 | Yes | 1 | 1 |
| ELL | 46 | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | 47 | | | |
| HSP | 43 | | | |
| MUL | 50 | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 39 | Yes | 1 | |
| FRL | 48 | | | |

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 | 25 | | | 43 | | | 24 | | | | | 63 |
| SWD | 8 | | | 10 | | | 6 | | | | 5 | 61 |
| ELL | 21 | | | 49 | | | 24 | | | | 5 | 63 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 27 | | | 40 | | | 15 | | | | 4 | |
| HSP | 22 | | | 43 | | | 26 | | | | 5 | 61 |

| 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 | 36 | | | 64 | | | | | | | 2 | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 31 | | | 38 | | | | | | | 2 | |
| FRL | 23 | | | 41 | | | 23 | | | | 5 | 64 |

| 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 | 27 | 50 | 64 | 41 | 65 | 53 | 27 | | | | | 57 |
| SWD | 20 | 37 | | 29 | 50 | 20 | 18 | | | | | 38 |
| ELL | 24 | 59 | 62 | 39 | 63 | 44 | 22 | | | | | 57 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 26 | 49 | | 33 | 73 | 75 | 26 | | | | | |
| HSP | 27 | 52 | 52 | 42 | 58 | 32 | 23 | | | | | 56 |
| MUL | 45 | | | 55 | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 18 | | | 60 | | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 28 | 50 | 62 | 41 | 68 | 52 | 26 | | | | | 55 |

| 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 | 27 | 45 | 56 | 31 | 26 | 22 | 19 | | | | | 56 |
| SWD | 26 | 44 | | 26 | 31 | | 21 | | | | | 32 |
| ELL | 21 | 42 | | 23 | 24 | | 14 | | | | | 56 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 24 | 37 | | 31 | 21 | | 18 | | | | | |
| HSP | 26 | 47 | | 28 | 29 | 20 | 18 | | | | | 54 |
| MUL | 55 | | | 45 | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 32 | | | 35 | | | | | | | | |

| 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 | 29 | 45 | 64 | 32 | 26 | 25 | 18 | | | | | 49 |

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 | 26% | 53% | -27% | 54% | -28% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 28% | 54% | -26% | 58% | -30% |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 18% | 47% | -29% | 50% | -32% |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 39% | 62% | -23% | 59% | -20% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 57% | 64% | -7% | 61% | -4% |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 49% | 61% | -12% | 55% | -6% |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 24% | 49% | -25% | 51% | -27% |

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.

When looking at all the data throughout all of our scores and the scores that will go towards our buckets and our school grade, the one that was the lowest performance of our intermediate grades was 3rd grade in both ELA and Math proficiency for our students. In 3rd grade our students only achieved 18% proficient in ELA, and 3rd grade only achieved 39% proficiency in Math. These both are way below our SIP goal of 50% for each. In 4th grade we reached and surpassed our goal with a 57% proficiency in Math and in 5th we almost made our SIP goal in math with a proficiency of 48%. We had a very difficult year in 3rd grade last year. We had a lot of absenteeism from both our students and especially our teachers in that grade level. One of the teachers had to take a leave of absence in the middle the year for personal/emotional reasons. The students also saw a lot of change from the beginning of the school year. After the 10 day count with allocations changed, we had to consolidate and lose a 2nd grade unit, and we were allocated another 3rd grade unit. We had to create a new classroom. That classroom never truly recovered and that teacher was very sickly and took many days off. This resulted in major behavior problems in that classroom and subsequently in 3rd grade. We decided to then arrange the classrooms again in 3rd grade when that teacher went on her leave of absence and she ended up just supporting all the absences of that grade level. We had also had major issues with buy in to our professional development and collaborative planning participation from that 3rd grade team. The trends that we saw throughout the three grade levels was the low ELA proficiency from the three grade levels, which were way below of SIP goal. 3rd was for sure the lowest with 18% proficiency for the school year.

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

Overall science went down 3% in proficiency and overall proficiency in ELA went down by 2%. The major factors that we feel contributed to this decline are lack of buy and consistency to collaborative planning, and bi-weekly professional development. Another factor is all the new staff, many new grade level teams, and poor work ethic from many teachers (absenteeism).

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.

For PM3 the state average was 50% proficient for 3rd and we were 18% here at Rogers. In 4th grade the state average was at 57% proficient and we were at 28%. In 5th grade the state average was 55% proficient and we were 27% proficient. In ELA we had the highest gap compared to the state. The trends we see is that all grade are way below in ELA proficient for our SIP our and compared to state average. Some factors include socio economic status and support with literacy at home, absenteeism from both students and teachers, behaviors that are affecting the learning environment, and finally buying from all the teachers with our initiatives to support them (collaborative planning and professional development).

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

4th grade overall showed the most improvement both in ELA and Math. From 3rd to 4th grade that group went from a 15% proficiency in ELA to a 28% proficiency in ELA. 4th Grade also went in 18% in math from the previous year, to the only grade level that reached our SIP goal in Math. All three grade levels showed growth in math proficiency. The new actions that we took the past school year was having an ILT member take an academics math group in 2nd through 5th grade, and we also did pull out groups for 3rd, 4th and 5th grade for our bubble students.

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

In look at all the grade levels the main area of concern is ELA proficiency. We are in need of additional professional support to assist our teachers in their delivery framework to reach our students, and also opportunities to progress monitor, and analyze student work to develop and implement next steps that

are needed to meet the needs of our students that will be essential to making the instructional decisions that are needed in not only ELA for all grade levels and also for MATH, Writing and Science.

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

The ranking of priorities are as followed to help support the goals in our SIP plan (1) Purposeful Standards-based instruction (through weekly collaborative planning with and ILT member), (2) Instructional Delivery Framework (gradual release model), (3) Responsive Student-Diven Instruction (Immediate Feedback and progress monitoring), (4)Parent Involvement (SAC meetings in conjunction to big events, (5) Behavior Support (Champs, Restorative practices, daily community circles).

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 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.

Instructional Delivery Framework (The Instructional Delivery Framework is the Gradual Release of Responsibility with the conclusion using the Reading/Writing Workshop where they gather again for accountability of work and the answering of the LEQ. During planning, the delivery is discussed, and sticky notes or notes are made on pages of the text were suggestions of the "I", which is the teacher "think aloud" using the strategy to assist in answering the LEQ. It is then planned where the "we" could begin and so forth.

This is very explicit planning and modeling from the ILT member in both weekly ELA and Math planning. An "I" of the delivery is modeled in planning if needed as well.) Lack of comprehensive understanding of the B.E.S.T. Standards and grade level outcomes for the B.E.S.T standards.

To support with our instructional delivery framework, we will be offering professional development that will be targeted to the specific needs of the teachers and students in our school. Teachers will also be also to have the opportunities to visit other classrooms that have aligned their instructions to the benchmarks standards an are having success. The instructional coach is pushing into classrooms and modeling, and having other teachers from different grade levels come and observe her teach those ELA benchmark-standard lessons.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By June 2024, 50% of the students will score proficient in ELA, Mathematics, and Science measured by state assessments through grade appropriate learning experiences aligned with grade-level of the B.E.S.T. Standards. Student achievement will improve in all core content areas through targeted support in the planning and delivery of purposeful standard-based instruction.

Monitoring:

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

An Instructional Leadership Team (ILT) member will provide instructional modeling and support within the classrooms at each grade level. Additionally, members of the ILT and Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) will present school-wide. Professional Development that is based on current student data. This work is to ensure all students receive consistent and effective standards-based instructional delivery in all academic areas and at all grade levels of the B.E.S.T. Standards. We will also have Monthly TCT's where the instructional coach meets with all the grade levels and they go through all their data points. They bring to the table the latest reading level, math scores, instructional needs to support their students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Michael Escorcia (escorcim@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 various data that will be continuously monitored to measure the effectiveness of said strategies: Teacher Evaluation System, FAST Data (PM1, PM2, and PM3) District Benchmark Assessments (writing and science), Lexia, DRA 2.0, Next Steps, and grade level common assessments, analyzing student work with grade-level rubrics, and monthly Acaletics scrimmage scores.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

School-wide data has shown that with purposeful instructional delivery, the students' comprehension of grade-level standards has been positively impacted. It is through the explicit teaching of the thinking strategy/process that the students are able to work toward meeting and or exceed the grade-level of the B.E.S.T. Standards. The idea is that no matter what level they are at they are always exposed to grade level standards, through the instructional practice of benchmark-aligned instruction.

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. All teachers, which include ESE, ESOL, and STEM teachers, will participate in weekly collaborative planning sessions grounded in grade-level standards both before and after the students' school day with an ILT and/or LLI member. This will include the planning of writing across the curriculum for all grades.
2. Highly Effective/effective teachers, ILT and/or LLI members will facilitate weekly professional development for comprehensive knowledge of the B.E.S.T. Standards, responsiveness to student work/ data, and how to effectively provide intentional and deliberate feedback.
3. Provide research-based classroom materials and supplies that support student learning in the instructional framework.
4. Weekly ILT meetings where we discussed how each grade level is progressing and any other needs of our school to ensure the success of our area of focus.

Person Responsible: Michael Escorcía (escorcim@manateeschools.net)

By When: These action steps will begin the first week of school and monitored weekly during the weekly Instructional Leadership Team meetings, where we will make decisions on the next steps.

Create a schedule for all meetings: Facilitated Collaborative Planning, ILT, TCT, IST, and other Data Chats. Establish expectations for FCP and deep dive into standards, resources, and students' instructional needs.

Person Responsible: Michael Escorcía (escorcim@manateeschools.net)

By When: Initial July 2023 to create schedules. On going yearlong for all other accountability meetings.

#2. 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.

Looking at our suspension and referrals throughout the past two years of this school, we see a need for positive relationships to be build between students and teachers/staff. We did a soft roll out last year of the CHAMPS intitutive and this year we are implemented it full force. Every classroom, all hallways, cafeteria, arrival and dismissal incorporate CHAMPS expectations for all student behaviors. Along with restorative practices, and daily community circles to build school and classroom community.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our measurable outcome will be to lower our discipline referals and suspensions by 20%. This will result in more students being in classrooms to get Tier I, Tier II and Tier III instruction that they need to meet our SIP goals.

Monitoring:

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

We will monitor through daily walks walks, observations, in the interactions in the hallways, cafeteria, recess and at arrival and dismissal. When we meet weekly at ILT we will discuss the the process of all the positive culture and environment initiatives. Throughout the school year, data discussions will assist faculty in monitor student behavior and academic performance through the MTSS process.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Michael Escorcia (escorcim@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.)

Research has shown that restorative practices, community circles, and CHAMPS have a positive effect on the relationships that are build between student to student and between students and teachers/staff. Restorative practices focus on fostering a sense of community within classroom to prevent conflict and on reacting to misbehavior by encouraging students to accept responsibility and build relationships.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Restorative practices focus on fostering a sense of community within classroom to prevent conflict and on reacting to misbehavior by encouraging students to accept responsibility and build relationships. Community circles help build a restorative culture in the classroom. CHAMPS allows all staff to use common terms that allow for universal expectations and procedures for positive behavior support.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

1. All staff get PD on CHAMPS, Restorative practices and community circles at the pre-planning week, with PD/Coaching throughout the school year.
2. Teacher will create their classroom management plan.
3. All classrooms, hallways, cafeteria, arrival and dismissal areas will have CHAMPS posters with expectations.
4. Daily community circles in every classroom, built into the master schedule.
5. Daily Student Pledge
6. Daily/Weekly monitor by ILT members

Person Responsible: Michael Escorcía (escorcim@manateeschools.net)

By When: This area of focus will begin in the pre-planning week with teachers creating their classroom management plan CHAMPS, and will be monitored throughout the school year for impact relating to the reduction of office discipline referrals and improved learning.

School-wide expectations for positive behavior support through CHAMPS. Teachers will create classroom management plans, to include restorative practices in response to behavioral needs.

Person Responsible: Michael Escorcía (escorcim@manateeschools.net)

By When: August 2023

On going PD/Coaching support for CHAMPS and restorative practices. On going review of data by grade level, by location, by teacher, and by student. Data analysis will drive the decisions on which teachers or students need support and Tier 1 PD.

Person Responsible: Michael Escorcía (escorcim@manateeschools.net)

By When: Yearlong observations, ILT and IST meetings.

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to White

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.

All students will be on a trajectory toward mastery of grade level benchmarks/standards in ELA and Math. Data indicates that white students at the school underperform as a student subgroup.

Measurable Outcome:

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

If Tier I instruction is aligned to the rigor of the benchmarks, scaffolded to address individualized students' needs, and designed to increase accountability for learning among all students, then ELA and Math proficiency will increase by 10% or more as measured by 2024 Spring FAST. This expected growth is applied to all students at each grade level and for each ESSA subgroup to meet or exceed 41% proficient. The aim is to effectively scaffold students' mastery of benchmarks while closing achievement gaps for non-proficient students.

Monitoring:

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

Systems for monitoring high-quality instruction include (1) Facilitated, collaborative planning; (2) Regular classroom observations with feedback and coaching; (3) Routine use of student performance data to make instructional decisions; (4) Multi-Tiered System of Support; and (5) regular team meetings, such as ILT, PLCs, and TCTs, to monitor progress toward school improvement.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Michael Escorcía (escorcim@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: (1) Strong, high-quality classroom instruction for all students; (2) Use of assessment data to measure and monitor academic/behavior progress; (3) Identification of at-risk students; (4) Targeted, evidenced-based interventions; and (5) Routine collaboration of school teams to determine when and where coaching and training are needed for improved 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.

1. Facilitated, collaborative planning to increase teacher expertise of what students must know, understand, and be able to do aligned to the rigor required of the benchmarks and to plan instructional

task that engage all students. Weekly collaborative planning will also address remedial and accelerated instruction for small groups and provide opportunities for problem-solving, discussion of high-effect practices, and ongoing review of student performance data.

2. Systems 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.

3. 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.

4. Create a calendar of yearlong meeting structures (ILT, TCT, PLC, and IST) to analyze student performance data, define key attributes of learners to address their unique needs, and evaluate available resources best matched to students' needs.

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

Person Responsible: Michael Escorcim (escorcim@manateeschools.net)

By When: Yearlong, on going

#4. 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.

All students will be on a trajectory toward mastery of grade level standards in ELA and Math. Students with disabilities underperform as a student subgroup.

Measurable Outcome:

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

If Tier I instruction is aligned to the rigor of the benchmarks, scaffolded to address individualized students' needs, and designed to increase accountability for learning among all students, then ELA and Math proficiency will increase by 10% or more as measured by 2024 Spring FAST. This expected growth is applied to all students at each grade level and for each ESSA subgroup to meet or exceed 41% proficient. The aim is to effectively scaffold students' mastery of benchmarks while closing achievement gaps for non-proficient students.

Monitoring:

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

Systems for monitoring high-quality instruction include (1) Facilitated, collaborative planning; (2) Regular classroom observations with feedback and coaching; (3) Routine use of student performance data to make instructional decisions; (4) Multi-Tiered System of Support; and (5) regular team meetings, such as ILT, PLCs, and TCTs, to monitor progress toward school improvement.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

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: (1) Strong, high-quality classroom instruction for all students; (2) Use of assessment data to measure and monitor academic/behavior progress; (3) Identification of at-risk students; (4) Targeted, evidenced-based interventions; and (5) Routine collaboration of school teams to determine when and where coaching and training are needed for improved 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.

1. Facilitated, collaborative planning to increase teacher expertise of what students must know, understand, and be able to do aligned to the rigor required of the benchmarks and to plan instructional

task that engage all students. Weekly collaborative planning will also address remedial and accelerated instruction for small groups and provide opportunities for problem-solving, discussion of high-effect practices, and ongoing review of student performance data.

2. Identify the instructional practice(s) that will increase teacher capacity and create a plan for coaching to accelerate improvement. Create systems for monitoring the focus, frequency, and types of coaching and support for improved teaching and learning.

3. Create a calendar of yearlong meeting structures (ILT, TCT, PLC, and IST) to analyze student performance data, define key attributes of learners to address their unique needs, and evaluate available resources best matched to students' needs.

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

Person Responsible: Michael Escorcim (escorcim@manateeschools.net)

By When: Yearlong, on going

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 kindergarten through second will receive direct and explicit instruction on the ELA B.E.S.T standards. Additional opportunities for targeted small group instruction and tiered interventions will be provided based on progress monitoring data. Teachers will integrate writing across all content areas to strengthen early literacy development and to ensure students' abilities to fully express ideas through reasoning and problem solving. United Way partnership to provide 1st grade literacy intervention instruction.

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

Students in grades third-fifth will receive direct and explicit instruction on the ELA B.E.S.T standards. Additional opportunities for targeted small group instruction and tiered interventions will be provided based on progress monitoring data. Teachers will integrate writing across all content areas to strengthen early literacy development and to ensure students' abilities to fully express ideas through reasoning, citing evidence, and problem solving.

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 2024 the Spring Star Early Literacy and Star Reading, 50% or more of students in grades K-2nd will earn a level 3 or higher.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

As measured by 2024 ELA Spring FAST, 50% or more of students in grades 3rd-5th will earn a level 3 or higher.

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 (1) Facilitated, collaborative planning; (2) Regular classroom observations with feedback and coaching; (3) Routine use of student performance data to make instructional decisions; (4) Multi-Tiered System of Support; and (5) regular team meetings, such as ILT, LLT, PLCs to monitor progress toward school improvement.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Escorcia, Michael, escorcim@manateeschools.net

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:

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

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida’s definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district’s K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Facilitated, collaborative planning to increase teacher expertise of remedial and intervention instruction for small groups and opportunities for problem-solving, discussion of high-effect practices, and ongoing review of student performance data. Teachers will use Decision-Tree instructional materials, including Benchmark Advance, Lexia and guided reading to ensure explicit and rigorous instruction for intervention.

Rationale:

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

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

The purpose of planning, implementing, and monitoring through responsive student-driven Instruction is to ensure the progression of student learning and increase grade-level literacy proficiency. Effectively delivered core, remedial, intervention and enrichment instruction will move students along the trajectory toward proficiency and above proficiency. The Comprehensive Evidenced-based Reading Plan and the Literacy Leadership Teams will provide guidance on literacy intervention instruction.

Action Steps to Implement

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

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

| Action Step | Person Responsible for Monitoring |
|---|---|
| <p>The Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) and the Instructional Leadership Team (ILT) will meet weekly to explain the weekly ELA collaborative planning with teams on the strategies for purposeful standard-based instruction and the instructional delivery framework. Teams will also collaboratively evaluate student work to be responsive of the student-driven instruction monthly to create and implement next steps to meet and/or exceed proficiency.</p> | <p>Escorcia, Michael, escorcim@manateeschools.net</p> |
| <p>The Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) will work alongside the United Way Program to ensure fidelity of the strategies being implemented.</p> | <p>Escorcia, Michael, escorcim@manateeschools.net</p> |
| <p>The Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) and the Instructional Leadership Team (ILT) will implement various coaching models as student and teacher data needs arise. This will be implemented through modeling, side by side coaching, co-teaching, and ongoing professional development.</p> | <p>Escorcia, Michael, escorcim@manateeschools.net</p> |
| <p>The Instructional Leadership Team (ILT) will develop and implement an after-school tutoring and enrichment program to provide an additional opportunity to learn to students to address needs based on data from various sources.</p> | <p>Escorcia, Michael, escorcim@manateeschools.net</p> |

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.

The School Improvement Plan will disseminated through various pathways not limited to: Annual TI Mtgs., School Advisory (SAC) meetings, Parent and Families Engagement Plan (PFEP), Parent Involvement (PI) events/meetings, state, district and school website. The SIP goal and areas of focus progress will be shared during SAC mtgs., school-wide events, parent-teacher conferences, ClassDojo, etc.

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))

Rogers Garden-Bullock will continuously build a positive relationships with all stakeholders (most importantly families) through the areas of focus in the SIP, home-school school-wide compact commitment, Parent and Families Engagement Plan (PFEP) and and through the fidelity of the various communication. Monthly Parent Engagement events (conjunction with SAC), Sunday messagaes sent to parents and staff, Activity calendar shared with parents, parent conference nights built into the calendar (Title I funds), school wide class-dojo, Facebook posting of all our events and ongoing communication with parents. Messages and instructions will be sent to parent about how to access the FOCUS portal to view progress reports and report cards. All forms of communication will have access to those instructions for the parents.

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)

All the SIP areas of focuses outline the strategies that will strengthen academics, behavior, and attendance needs. Additional opportunities to learn will be implemented such as before-after school enrichment, school clubs, dedicated commitment to participate in district events, and various in-school and out-of-school field trips. We also have the dual language program from kindergarten to 3rd grade and accelerated math for 3rd, 4th and 5th grade students.

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))

Families are made aware and at times work with the many district's programs and departments such as Project Heart, Migrant Program, ESE and ESOL Department. At every event we invite our community partners that work together with our families to provide them access to any resources that are available to our school community. We also run a weekly food pantry for our parents and community members to participate in.

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))

This year we are lucky to have our new counselor that is supporting our students in many ways. She runs the daily community circle and posts all the videos that support our studens and teachers on schoology. She has created calming boxes for every classroom to support our students. She runs groups for every grade level them in life events and gives them strategies to find success in their classroom. We also have two organizations that work with us to mentor our students. Truly valued works with our 3rd, 4th and 5th grade students and we select them based on their needs. The sheriff department works with our GET for a mentoring program for our 5th grade boys and they come weekly

to mentor them. Because we are a school in need, we also have a full time Mental Health Counselor that works with our students and families (20 at a time).

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))

Pre-K and Fifth Grade transition meetings are implemented. We also have middle schools that work with us and come and present their school for our 5th grade students.

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).

Here at Rogers Garden-Bullock elementary we believe in Positive Behavior Interventions and Support. Our school implements CHAMPS and Restorative Practice when appropriate. We do morning circles everyday to start off our day and end our day with a mindful moment. We also implements various supports through the Multi-Tier System of Support. We follow different steps to support our students both academically, emotionally and behaviorally. We use MTSS and IST meetings to bring tiered support to the students that have been brought to us for our support and their success

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))

Here at Rogers Garden-Bullock Elementary we have bi-weekly professional develop to support the specific needs of our teachers and what they want to grow in. They have choices in their professional learning and we believe in having our teachers become leaders in our community and many of them lead our professional development to support and model for each other.

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))

Pre-K transition meetings are set up mid-year and at the end of the year with families.

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: Benchmark-aligned Instruction | \$0.00 |
| 2 | III.B. | Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other | \$0.00 |
| 3 | III.B. | Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: White | \$0.00 |
| 4 | 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