
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	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Ida M. Stewart Elementary School

7905 15TH AVE NW, Bradenton, FL 34209

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Department encourages schools to use the SIP as a “living document” by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of Stewart Elementary School is to stimulate students to become self-motivated, life-long learners by providing appropriate educational experience through the involvement of staff, parents, and community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is to provide a safe and stimulating environment where students are trustworthy and take learning seriously to reach their highest academic, social and emotional potential. Students will meet these high expectations while learning how to be respectful and responsible citizens so they can make their best contribution to society.

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
Hougland, Joseph	Principal	Administration
Butler, Brenda	Teacher, K-12	5th Grade Teacher
Cobb, Mary	Teacher, K-12	1st Grade Teacher
Heathcote, Lisa	Assistant Principal	Administration
Bosner, Heather	Teacher, K-12	4th Grade Teacher
Schultz, Kim	Teacher, K-12	2nd Grade Teacher
Thomas, Vanzetta	Teacher, K-12	3rd Grade Teacher
Drao, Heather	Teacher, K-12	Media Specialist

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.

There will be at least three scheduled meetings to include all of those listed above, including the SAC committee. Each group will be able to share their input in the creation of the SIP based on recent data to plan for the 2023-24 school year. All ideas and suggestions will be up for discussion for adding to the SIP plan.

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 will be monitoring the SIP after each set of data come back from recent assessments. This will allow us to review the progress towards our SIP goals and make any revisions as we progress through the school year. When revising, we will include the Leadership Team and SAC committee in order to allow input from all stakeholders.

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	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	19%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	35%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
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) Hispanic Students (HSP) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A

	2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	5
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	1	0	0	3	6	1	0	0	0	11
Course failure in Math	1	0	0	2	2	2	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	6	5	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	4	4	0	0	0	9
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

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

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	1	1	3	5	4	0	0	0	14
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	4	5	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	5	1	0	0	0	6
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	3	5	4	7	4	0	0	0	24

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	4	5	0	0	0	9

The number of students identified retained:

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

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	1	1	3	5	4	0	0	0	14
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	4	5	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	5	1	0	0	0	6
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	3	5	4	7	4	0	0	0	24

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	4	5	0	0	0	9

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

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

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

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	77	51	53	78	55	56	73		
ELA Learning Gains				67			64		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				37			69		
Math Achievement*	82	62	59	86	50	50	79		
Math Learning Gains				81			82		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				73			62		
Science Achievement*	81	51	54	71	65	59	65		
Social Studies Achievement*					66	64			
Middle School Acceleration					51	52			
Graduation Rate					52	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress		59	59						

* 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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	79
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	317
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	70
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	493
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	55			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	66			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	83			

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	73			

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	42			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	66			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	71			
FRL	61			

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	77			82			81					
SWD	50			47			67				4	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	64			68							2	
MUL												

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
PAC												
WHT	81			84			82				4	
FRL	73			75			75				4	

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	78	67	37	86	81	73	71					
SWD	37	35	24	62	69	50	14					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	74	58		58	75							
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	78	66	33	89	82	77	72					
FRL	70	63	33	70	70	64	58					

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	73	64	69	79	82	62	65					
SWD	36	60		59	70		20					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	47			53								
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	77	74		82	87		79					
FRL	52	61		57	74		39					

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	82%	53%	29%	54%	28%
04	2023 - Spring	83%	54%	29%	58%	25%
03	2023 - Spring	75%	47%	28%	50%	25%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	83%	62%	21%	59%	24%
04	2023 - Spring	85%	64%	21%	61%	24%
05	2023 - Spring	88%	61%	27%	55%	33%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	82%	49%	33%	51%	31%

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.

Our 3rd grade ELA was at 75% proficient and our goal was at least 80%. Historically, our students have struggled with vocabulary - and Standard ELA 3.V.1.1 and ELA 3.V.1.3.

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

We stayed at the same or higher levels in all areas.

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.

The state Science proficiency was at 41%. Stewart proficiency was at 81%. We have worked hard to support our learning in Science with vocabulary reinforcement, STEM specials class and Mad Science classes and end of year review, and new WOZ resources were all contributing factors to this success.

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

See answer to #3.

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

We will work to support our 4th grade ELA students, with an emphasis on academic vocabulary. During the writing process students will focus on correctly using academic vocabulary.

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

We will improve ELA vocabulary instruction in 3rd grade, and support our 4th grade ELA students in their challenge areas.

Area of Focus

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

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

We plan to continue to provide common planning time, planning days for grade level teams each semester, quarterly lunches with admin with grade / specialist teams, morale boosters, Sunshine Committee, mentor teachers assigned to new staff, and strong PTO support.

Measurable Outcome:

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

When we provide support and planning times (listed above), we will achieve 95% staff retention August, 2024.

Monitoring:

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

Administration will schedule and facilitate these activities. We will monitor through daily communication with stakeholders.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Joseph Hougland (houglandj@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.)

Stewart will prioritize safety, community, and collaboration amongst all stakeholders including faculty, parents and caregivers, and the community.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Research reveals that academic achievement is impacted by a healthy school climate and culture that addresses not only academic needs, but also fosters students' feelings of safety, addresses health and mental health issues, and establishes high expectations for academic success.

We continue to focus on developing strong partnerships with parents and families, businesses, faith-based organizations, and youth development agencies to address these priorities beyond the school day. In addition, teacher effectiveness tends to improve more over time when teachers are working in supportive professional environments as opposed to when they are working in less supportive contexts.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

Schedule common planning times for each grade level each semester.

Person Responsible: Lisa Heathcote (heathcotel@manateeschools.net)

By When: September, 2024

Schedule quarterly lunches with teams.

Person Responsible: Lisa Heathcote (heathcotel@manateeschools.net)

By When: May, 2024

Implement staff appreciation week, Holiday Road, and handwritten cards to show our appreciation for all the amazing work that supports our school community.

Person Responsible: Joseph Houglan (houglan@manateeschools.net)

By When: May, 2024

Implement staff appreciation week, Holiday Road, and handwritten cards to show our appreciation for all the amazing work that supports our school community.

Person Responsible: Joseph Houglan (houglan@manateeschools.net)

By When: May, 2024

Implement staff appreciation week, Holiday Road, and handwritten cards to show our appreciation for all the amazing work that supports our school community.

Person Responsible: Joseph Houglan (houglan@manateeschools.net)

By When: May, 2024

Implement staff appreciation week, Holiday Road, and handwritten cards to show our appreciation for all the amazing work that supports our school community.

Person Responsible: Joseph Houglan (houglan@manateeschools.net)

By When: May, 2024

Implement staff appreciation week, Holiday Road, and handwritten cards to show our appreciation for all the amazing work that supports our school community.

Person Responsible: Joseph Houglan (houglan@manateeschools.net)

By When: May, 2024

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

To support the continuous improvement of ELA achievement, we will focus of the instruction and use of academic vocabulary in grades 3 - 5.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By May, 2024, 80% or more of 3rd - 5th graders will be proficient on the FAST ELA. In addition, we will show improvement on District Benchmarks and formal writing assessments which measure academic vocabulary.

Monitoring:

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

We will monitor this area of focus with each grade level team during data meetings. We will focus on supporting our students in T2/T3 and specifically, closely monitor our L25 students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lisa Heathcote (heathcotel@manateeschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Tier 1 students are supported by general education curriculum. Tiers 2 and 3 students are supported within the MTSS process according to their specific needs. We look forward to utilizing LEXIA to pinpoint specific gaps in academic vocabulary.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

LEXIA is evidence-based and chosen by SDMC.

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.

Academic vocabulary will be explicitly taught during WIN (What I Need) time. This is scheduled for 30 minutes a day, 5 days a week.

Person Responsible: Lisa Heathcote (heathcotel@manateeschools.net)

By When: May, 2024

One teacher from each grade level team, and at least one administrator will complete the LEXIA Academy.

Person Responsible: Lisa Heathcote (heathcotel@manateeschools.net)

By When: January, 2024

#3. -- Select below -- specifically relating to

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.

To support the continuous improvement of ELA achievement, we will focus of the instruction and use of academic vocabulary in grades 3 - 5.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By May, 2024, 80% or more of 3rd - 5th graders will be proficient on the FAST ELA. In addition, we will show improvement on District Benchmarks and formal writing assessments which measure academic vocabulary.

Monitoring:

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

We will monitor this area of focus with each grade level team during data meetings. We will focus on supporting our students in T2/T3 and specifically, closely monitor our L25 students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lisa Heathcote (heathcotel@manateeschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Tier 1 students are supported by general education curriculum. Tiers 2 and 3 students are supported within the MTSS process according to their specific needs. We look forward to utilizing LEXIA to pinpoint specific gaps in academic vocabulary.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

LEXIA is evidence-based and chosen by SDMC.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#4. -- Select below -- specifically relating to

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.

To support the continuous improvement of ELA achievement, we will focus of the instruction and use of academic vocabulary in grades 3 - 5.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By May, 2024, 80% or more of 3rd - 5th graders will be proficient on the FAST ELA. In addition, we will show improvement on District Benchmarks and formal writing assessments which measure academic vocabulary.

Monitoring:

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

We will monitor this area of focus with each grade level team during data meetings. We will focus on supporting our students in T2/T3 and specifically, closely monitor our L25 students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lisa Heathcote (heathcotel@manateeschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Tier 1 students are supported by general education curriculum. Tiers 2 and 3 students are supported within the MTSS process according to their specific needs. We look forward to utilizing LEXIA to pinpoint specific gaps in academic vocabulary.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

LEXIA is evidence-based and chosen by SDMC.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#5. -- Select below -- specifically relating to

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.

To support the continuous improvement of ELA achievement, we will focus of the instruction and use of academic vocabulary in grades 3 - 5.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By May, 2024, 80% or more of 3rd - 5th graders will be proficient on the FAST ELA. In addition, we will show improvement on District Benchmarks and formal writing assessments which measure academic vocabulary.

Monitoring:

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

We will monitor this area of focus with each grade level team during data meetings. We will focus on supporting our students in T2/T3 and specifically, closely monitor our L25 students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lisa Heathcote (heathcotel@manateeschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Tier 1 students are supported by general education curriculum. Tiers 2 and 3 students are supported within the MTSS process according to their specific needs. We look forward to utilizing LEXIA to pinpoint specific gaps in academic vocabulary.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

LEXIA is evidence-based and chosen by SDMC.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#6. -- Select below -- specifically relating to

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.

To support the continuous improvement of ELA achievement, we will focus of the instruction and use of academic vocabulary in grades 3 - 5.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By May, 2024, 80% or more of 3rd - 5th graders will be proficient on the FAST ELA. In addition, we will show improvement on District Benchmarks and formal writing assessments which measure academic vocabulary.

Monitoring:

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

We will monitor this area of focus with each grade level team during data meetings. We will focus on supporting our students in T2/T3 and specifically, closely monitor our L25 students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lisa Heathcote (heathcotel@manateeschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Tier 1 students are supported by general education curriculum. Tiers 2 and 3 students are supported within the MTSS process according to their specific needs. We look forward to utilizing LEXIA to pinpoint specific gaps in academic vocabulary.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

LEXIA is evidence-based and chosen by SDMC.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus