

Manatee County Public Schools

Barbara A Harvey 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	23
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	23
VI. Title I Requirements	26
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	28

Barbara A Harvey Elementary School

8610 115TH AVE E, Parrish, FL 34219

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

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.

Barbara Harvey Elementary reflects our namesake: Passionate and dedicated educators who treat everyone like family. We give away hugs while elevating academic success. We care for each child, finding their learning style and adapting to their needs. We connect with parents and the community to produce socially responsible citizens of the world. We make memories every day in a warm and friendly environment so students feel valued. Our passion is contagious!

Provide the school's vision statement.

We will create a sense of family while providing lifelong memories for our students and instilling a passion for learning.

Family, Memories, Passion

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
Rio, Hayley	Principal	To ensure the safety and security of our campus while providing a highly effective instructional learning environment for our students and staff. Duties include reviewing and monitoring safety concerns, monitoring data, providing professional learning for staff, involving the community, and monitoring the overall instructional environment.
Whightsel, Kristina	Assistant Principal	To ensure the safety and security of our campus while providing a highly effective instructional learning environment for our students and staff. Duties include reviewing and monitoring safety concerns, monitoring data, providing professional learning for staff, involving the community, and monitoring the overall instructional environment.
Bench, Shelby	Assistant Principal	To ensure the safety and security of our campus while providing a highly effective instructional learning environment for our students and staff. Duties include reviewing and monitoring safety concerns, monitoring data, providing professional learning for staff, involving the community, and monitoring the overall instructional environment.

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.

The 2022-2023 school data was shared with the school leadership team during the summer of 2023, beginning of the school year it was shared with all school staff, and also with all stakeholders at the first SAC meeting in August of 2023. Suggestions for goals and target areas were shared and feedback was solicited.

SIP Monitoring

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

The Instructional Leadership team will meet after each progress monitoring window for the FAST of ELA and Math. First we will be analyzing the growth of our 3rd grade retainees, 4th and 5th graders from PM3 of 2023 to PM1 of the 2023-2024 school year and then again from PM1 to PM2. We will determine if there is a need for additional support such as small groups or one on one support to ensure the necessary growth that is needed for each student. We will also be identifying students in 3rd grade that might also need additional support to meet proficiency by the end of the year.

Instructional Leadership Team Meetings as follows;

9/19 9am ELA PM1

9/28 9am Math PM1

10/26 9am Science

11/16 9am T2/T3 review

12/19 9am Math PM2

1/25 9am ELA PM2

2/8 9am Science

3/5 9am T2/T3 review

4/9 9am T2/T3 review

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	33%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	37%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification	ATSI

*updated as of 3/11/2024	
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: 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	15	17	18	19	21	10	0	0	0	100	
One or more suspensions	4	1	1	2	4	1	0	0	0	13	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	14	10	12	0	0	0	36	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	13	12	10	0	0	0	35	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	42	38	18	0	0	0	98	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	35	25	15	0	0	0	75	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	22	2	0	0	0	0	24	

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	1	11	10	11	0	0	0	33

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	1	11	14	1	0	0	0	27
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)**The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	46	36	22	35	24	18	0	0	0	181	
One or more suspensions	2	2	3	10	4	2	0	0	0	23	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	12	7	13	0	0	0	32	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	13	11	11	0	0	0	35	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	34	16	16	0	0	0	66	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	29	17	17	0	0	0	63	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	27	1	0	0	0	0	28	

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	1	2	10	11	9	0	0	0	33

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	1	0	14	1	0	0	0	0	16
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	46	36	22	35	24	18	0	0	0	181	
One or more suspensions	2	2	3	10	4	2	0	0	0	23	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	12	7	13	0	0	0	32	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	13	11	11	0	0	0	35	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	34	16	16	0	0	0	66	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	29	17	17	0	0	0	63	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	27	1	0	0	0	0	28	

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	1	2	10	11	9	0	0	0	33

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	1	0	14	1	0	0	0	0	16
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*	59	51	53	64	55	56	60		
ELA Learning Gains				70			63		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				64			57		
Math Achievement*	72	62	59	76	50	50	74		
Math Learning Gains				79			84		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				62			83		
Science Achievement*	67	51	54	66	65	59	70		
Social Studies Achievement*					66	64			
Middle School Acceleration					51	52			
Graduation Rate					52	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	75	59	59	60			58		

* 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	66
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	330
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	68
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	541
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
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	32	Yes	2	
ELL	60			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	36	Yes	1	
HSP	64			
MUL	53			
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	69			
FRL	60			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	37	Yes	1	
ELL	54			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	52			
HSP	61			
MUL	84			
PAC				
WHT	73			
FRL	62			

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	59			72			67					75
SWD	25			27			57				4	
ELL	42			73			50				4	75
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	40			44			36				4	
HSP	54			76			50				5	80

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	55			67							3	
PAC												
WHT	62			75			76				4	
FRL	52			64			71				5	72

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	64	70	64	76	79	62	66					60
SWD	24	46	50	35	44	39	6					50
ELL	39	52	67	63	65	57	27					60
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	37	55	40	53	76	73	33					
HSP	53	60	62	68	67	55	54					65
MUL	72	91		88	100		70					
PAC												
WHT	70	73	75	81	83	57	74					
FRL	51	65	65	66	76	64	48					61

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	60	63	57	74	84	83	70					58
SWD	12	35	40	38	59		25					
ELL	22	43		43	64		21					58
AMI												
ASN	82			73								
BLK	21			53								
HSP	33	50	46	52	77	80	42					57
MUL	80			80								
PAC												
WHT	73	74		85	94	90	87					

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	38	49	60	60	71	77	53					61

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	71%	53%	18%	54%	17%
04	2023 - Spring	61%	54%	7%	58%	3%
03	2023 - Spring	56%	47%	9%	50%	6%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	64%	62%	2%	59%	5%
04	2023 - Spring	75%	64%	11%	61%	14%
05	2023 - Spring	78%	61%	17%	55%	23%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	65%	49%	16%	51%	14%

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.

- ELA proficiency in 1st grade at 45%
- New state assessment
- Rapid student growth continues to be a factor in Harvey's achievement data. From year to year, we are comparing different groups of students due to the addition of a large number of incoming students throughout the year. Additionally, rapid student growth necessitates larger class sizes and new teachers being hired. These factors can create challenges in the instructional momentum in our classrooms.

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

- ELA proficiency in 4th grade (73% to 62% - a decline of 11%).
- During the 22-23 school year there were a total of eight 4th grade teachers and six were new to the school/grade level.
- The continued growth and class sizes also are contributing factors.

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.

In 3rd-5th grade in both areas, ELA and Math and in 5th grade Science we were above the state average.

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

Gains were noted with our students with disabilities.

- Based on the students needs SWD's received ELA supplemental instruction through the use of SIPPS, i-Ready toolkit lessons, and the Benchmark T2 intervention kit.
- In the area of math, Envision, along with First in Math and Success Maker (for K-2nd gr.) was utilized with fidelity.

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

-3rd grade retained students

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

1. An increase of proficiency as measured by the FAST among students with disabilities
2. An increase of proficiency as measured by the ELA FAST among K-2/3-5 students.
3. An increase of proficiency as measured by the SSA among 5th grade students.

Area of Focus

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

#1. 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.

Currently, 40% of Harvey's SWD's are performing at a level of proficiency as measured by the FAST.

Measurable Outcome:

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

At the conclusion of the 23-24 school year, at least 41% of Harvey's SWD's will be performing at a level of proficiency as measured by the FAST.

Monitoring:

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

The performance of our SWD's will be monitored three times a year according to the FAST and also through school and classroom based assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Hayley Rio (rio2h@manateeschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

In addition to the district's primary instructional resources, based on their needs SWD's may receive ELA supplemental instruction through the use of SIPPS, In Tandem lessons, Lexia lessons, and the Benchmark T2 intervention kit. In the area of math, Envision and First in Math will be utilized with fidelity.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The resources noted above are all district approved and provided resources. They have been vetted as quality instructional resources according to district and state guidelines.

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.

Provide training and support to staff on the implementation of the resources indicated above.

Person Responsible: Hayley Rio (rio2h@manateeschools.net)

By When: Training will be provided during each quarter of the 2023-2024 school year.

Monitor the effectiveness of the instruction our SWD's are receiving.

Person Responsible: Hayley Rio (rio2h@manateeschools.net)

By When: After each quarter and FAST assessment.

Provide regular opportunities to review the data of our SWD's and adjust instruction accordingly.

Person Responsible: Hayley Rio (rio2h@manateeschools.net)

By When: After each quarter and FAST assessment.

Support teachers with professional development, as needed.

Person Responsible: Hayley Rio (rio2h@manateeschools.net)

By When: During each quarter of the 2023-2024 school year and as needed.

#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.

Math proficiency in 3rd-5th grade students continues to be higher than our ELA proficiency. Although these grade levels are above the state average in ELA, it continues to be an area of focus.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By the end of the 23-24 school year, at least 65% of Harvey's 3rd-5th grade students will demonstrate proficiency in ELA according to FAST.

Monitoring:

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

The performance of our students will be monitored three times a year according to the FAST and also through school and classroom based assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Hayley Rio (rio2h@manateeschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

In addition to the district's primary instructional resources, based on their needs, students may receive ELA supplemental instruction through the use of SIPPS, In Tandem, Lexia lessons, and the Benchmark T2 intervention kit.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The resources noted above are all district approved and provided resources. They have been vetted as quality instructional resources according to district and state guidelines.

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.

Provide training and support to staff on the implementation of the resources indicated above.

Person Responsible: Hayley Rio (rio2h@manateeschools.net)

By When: Training will be provided each quarter during the 2023-2024 school year.

Monitor the effectiveness of the ELA instruction our students are receiving.

Person Responsible: Hayley Rio (rio2h@manateeschools.net)

By When: Each quarter and after each FAST assessment.

Provide regular opportunities to review our students' data and adjust instruction accordingly.

Person Responsible: Hayley Rio (rio2h@manateeschools.net)

By When: Each quarter and after each FAST assessment.

Support teachers with training and additional resources, as needed.

Person Responsible: Hayley Rio (rio2h@manateeschools.net)

By When: Each quarter and when the need arises based on the data.

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

Although we saw a 1% increase in science proficiency last year with 67% of Harvey's 5th graders scoring a level 3 or above on the state assessment, it continues to be an area of focus.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By the end of the 23-24 school year, at least 70% of Harvey's 5th grade students will demonstrate proficiency in science according to the SSA.

Monitoring:

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

The performance of our 5th graders will be monitored through district benchmark assessments also through classroom based assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Hayley Rio (rio2h@manateeschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

In addition to the district's primary instructional resources, teachers will utilize the science resources available in Schoology and hands-on experiments through weekly classroom labs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The resources noted above are all district approved and provided resources. They have been vetted as quality instructional resources according to district and state guidelines.

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.

Provide training and support to new staff on the implementation of the resources indicated above.

Person Responsible: Hayley Rio (rio2h@manateeschools.net)

By When: During each quarter for the 2023-2024 school year training and supported will be provided.

Monitor the effectiveness of the science instruction our students are receiving.

Person Responsible: Hayley Rio (rio2h@manateeschools.net)

By When: After each quarter and after each District assessment.

Provide regular opportunities to review our students' data and adjust instruction accordingly.

Person Responsible: Hayley Rio (rio2h@manateeschools.net)

By When: After each quarter and after each District assessment.

Ensure the 3rd and 4th grade teams are providing regular science instruction to support the tested science standards in 5th grade.

Person Responsible: Hayley Rio (rio2h@manateeschools.net)

By When: Monitor lesson plans and support grade level planning weekly.

#4. 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.

Rapid student growth continues to be a factor in Harvey's achievement data and retaining and/or recruiting highly effective teachers is needed to support the academic success of all students.

Measurable Outcome:

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

At the conclusion of the 23-24 school year we will have retained 90% of our Harvey staff members.

Monitoring:

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

Feedback on district surveys, observations and walks.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Hayley Rio (rio2h@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.)

Create a positive school culture and environment where new staff members are quickly 'onboarded' by teammates and administration. Our vision, "Family, Memories, Passion" drives all that we do at Harvey. The use of "Fin"tastic Actions to recognize individual staff members.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

When staff are supported, recognized and work in a family like environment the probability of their retention increases.

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.

Faculty Commitment

Evident daily in the desire to demonstrate "The Harvey Difference" in every aspect of our school. New staff members are quickly 'onboarded' by teammates and administration.

Person Responsible: Hayley Rio (rio2h@manateeschools.net)

By When: By August 10th 2023.

Expectations & Rules

SHARKS Expectation for our school drive classroom behavior plans. Classroom mission statements are posted outside of every classroom.

Teachers implement behavior management plans that are aligned with SPARK. Students are taught strategies for activities and transitions that are aligned with CHAMPS.

Person Responsible: Hayley Rio (rio2h@manateeschools.net)

By When: Classroom mission statement - August 31, 2023 Management plans - throughout the 2023-2024 school year.

Reward/Recognition Program

We use "Fin"tastic Actions to recognize individual students and adults on campus. Additionally, we use a House System to award points for students demonstrating positive character traits.

Person Responsible: Hayley Rio (rio2h@manateeschools.net)

By When: "Fin"tastic Actions - throughout the 2023-2024 school year. House System points - throughout the 2023-2024 school year.

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

Harvey will abide by the district's guidelines regarding any school improvement funding allocations. Any materials purchased by the school will be approved by the school district.

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

45% of first grade students during the 22-23 school year were proficient in Reading/ELA. ELA instructional practices include Benchmark Advance whole group and small group instruction. Additional small group instruction utilizing In Tandem/Literacy Footprints for Grades K/1. Lexia will also be utilized to supplement/compliment ELA instruction.

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

3rd-5th grade students exceeded 50% proficiency in Reading/ELA. ELA instructional practices include Benchmark Advance whole group and small group instruction. Lexia will also be utilized to supplement/compliment ELA instruction.

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 the 2024 ELA spring FAST, 50% or more of 1st grade students will earn a level 3 or higher. 45% of first grade students during the 22-23 school year were proficient in Reading/ELA.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Not applicable

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 and TLC's, to monitor progress toward school improvement.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Rio, Hayley, rioh@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 CORE, In Tandem/Literacy Footprints in K/1st gr., and/or SIPPS 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 responsive instruction is to ensure the progression of student learning and increase grade-level literacy proficiency. Effectively delivered core, remedial, and intervention instruction will move students along the trajectory toward proficiency. The Comprehensive Evidenced-based Reading Plan, Decision-Trees, and 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
1. In the area of Literacy Leadership, 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.	Rio, Hayley, rioh@manateeschools.net
2. In the area of Literacy Coaching, we will define Look Fors related to high-quality instruction that are present every day, in every classroom, and for the benefit of every student. Create and use systems for monitoring Look Fors to strengthen alignment of daily instructional tasks to grade level benchmarks, ensure fidelity use of instructional resources for remedial and intervention instruction, and utilize strategies to engage all students.	Rio, Hayley, rioh@manateeschools.net
3. As an additional component of Literacy Coaching, we will 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.	Rio, Hayley, rioh@manateeschools.net
4. Assessment analysis and professional learning occur through ILT, TCT, PLC, IST 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.	Rio, Hayley, rioh@manateeschools.net
5. Implement a response to intervention framework (MTSS) to support students' academic and behavioral success.	Rio, Hayley, rioh@manateeschools.net

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

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

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

NA

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))

NA

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)

NA

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))

NA

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

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

NA

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

NA

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

NA

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

NA

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

NA

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	\$0.00
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Teacher Retention and Recruitment	\$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.

Yes