Robert H. Prine Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Robert H. Prine Elementary School

3801 SOUTHERN PKWY W, Bradenton, FL 34205

https://www.manateeschools.net/prine

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.

Prine Elementary is committed to creating an environment that provides our students a balanced, enriched curriculum that meets our students academic and social/emotional needs. We prepare our students for success in both life and academics by participating in a strong, well-rounded instructional program that meets the needs of the whole child. This strong, well-rounded instructional program incorporates collaboration, collaborative planning practices, and analysis of a student data for instructional practices to help close learning gaps and increase student achievement.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Prine Elementary sets high standards for academic and social/emotional learning and celebrates the achievement of every child.

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
Sander, Greg	Principal	
Cooke, Mary	Assistant Principal	

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.

SBLT met to review 2022-2023 academic, behavioral, and attendance data. The SIP development also included feedback from families as it related to the review of the 22-23 PFEP and HSC. Teachers reviewed PM3 data available in May of 2023. PM3 data and summer school data were reviewed during August 2023 grade level team meetings.

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 SBLT team meets weekly to review student data and progress of SIP goals. Teachers meet weekly with Instructional Coaches to assist with lesson planning, instructional delivery, intervention, and progress monitoring. The SIP will be revised during SBLT meetings, as necessary, based on student needs to ensure continuous improvement.

Demographic Data
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

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

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	17	18	18	10	14	12	0	0	0	89
One or more suspensions	3	3	2	13	4	7	0	0	0	32
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	2	6	46	61	58	0	0	0	173
Course failure in Math	0	2	3	40	52	45	0	0	0	142
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	16	28	32	0	0	0	76
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	13	14	30	0	0	0	57
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	

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	3	12	11	11	0	0	0	37

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	1	0	16	0	0	0	0	0	17
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	48	41	40	37	27	41	0	0	0	234
One or more suspensions	3	2	1	3	7	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in ELA	45	51	41	80	59	47	0	0	0	323
Course failure in Math	16	3	5	12	13	14	0	0	0	63
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	61	51	36	0	0	0	148
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	34	43	30	0	0	0	107
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	

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

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

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	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
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	48	41	40	37	27	41	0	0	0	234
One or more suspensions	3	2	1	3	7	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in ELA	45	51	41	80	59	47	0	0	0	323
Course failure in Math	16	3	5	12	13	14	0	0	0	63
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	61	51	36	0	0	0	148
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	34	43	30	0	0	0	107
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	

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

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

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	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
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*	33	51	53	37	55	56	34		
ELA Learning Gains				52			37		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				45			42		
Math Achievement*	47	62	59	50	50	50	49		
Math Learning Gains				55			49		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				42			44		
Science Achievement*	25	51	54	40	65	59	29		
Social Studies Achievement*					66	64			
Middle School Acceleration					51	52			
Graduation Rate					52	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	55	59	59	55			47		

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	39
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	193
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	47

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	376
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	20	Yes	4	1
ELL	31	Yes	3	1
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	32	Yes	3	
HSP	41			
MUL	19	Yes	2	1
PAC				
WHT	40	Yes	1	
FRL	38	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	36	Yes	3	
ELL	39	Yes	2	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	40	Yes	2	
HSP	46			

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%
MUL	33	Yes	1	
PAC				
WHT	49			
FRL	46			

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	33			47			25					55
SWD	9			18			14				5	54
ELL	22			39			8				5	55
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	29			40			10				5	57
HSP	32			52			29				5	57
MUL	23			15							2	
PAC												
WHT	38			49			32				5	40
FRL	32			47			25				5	54

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	37	52	45	50	55	42	40					55
SWD	27	38	45	29	47	36	25					44
ELL	23	45	42	42	44	33	25					55
AMI												
ASN												

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
BLK	26	42	33	43	44	45	35					50
HSP	35	52	41	52	54	38	37					58
MUL	36			30								
PAC												
WHT	47	54		52	61	43	50					33
FRL	34	48	48	47	52	45	37					57

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	34	37	42	49	49	44	29					47
SWD	21	33		26	28		31					30
ELL	25	35	44	46	46	46	18					47
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	27	20		42	35		24					
HSP	30	37	38	48	52	36	24					48
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	44	57		60	64		50					47
FRL	29	34	44	45	48	50	27					44

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	32%	53%	-21%	54%	-22%
04	2023 - Spring	39%	54%	-15%	58%	-19%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	29%	47%	-18%	50%	-21%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	54%	62%	-8%	59%	-5%
04	2023 - Spring	51%	64%	-13%	61%	-10%
05	2023 - Spring	42%	61%	-19%	55%	-13%

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.

The lowest performance area was 5th grade level one performance on statewide ELA and Math assessments. During the previous year, 4th grade students had high course failures in ELA and Math and scored level 1 on statewide ELA and Math assessments. Contributing factors include the need to address diverse learning needs and abilities during Tier one instructional time as well as ensuring correct interventions are used during tier 2 and 3 interventions. Trends emerge showing students in the intermediate grades with high numbers of ela and math course failures aligning to high numbers of level 1 on statewide ELA and Math assessments.

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

Course failures in Math for grades 3 - 5 saw the greatest decline from the previous year. Factors that may have contributed to this decline may include the need to provide adequate support, such as intervention programs, to help students struggling with math. Interventions are needed in part due to the disruption the pandemic caused to foundational learning. Last year's 3rd - 5th graders would have been impacted by remote learning.

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.

When compared to the state average, 3rd, 4th and 5th grade students performed lower than the state average with a higher percentage scoring at a level 1 and 2 on the statewide ELA assessment. Math score comparisons showed only slightly lower than the state average with 4th and 5th grade percentages at level 1 showing the biggest gap. Factors that may have contributed to the gap when compared to the state average include socioeconomic disparities, and curriculum access for English Language Learners and special education students.

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

The data components that showed the most improvement were the level 1 results on the statewide ELA and Math assessments for grades 3 - 5. The new actions included identifying specific areas of concern and the implementation of targeted interventions as part of the IST process. Progress monitoring of students in extended hour assisted in making sure the students received the correct interventions. ESOL support was also provided for students in the 3rd grade academy class and those with most need in 4th and 5th grades. In addition, attendance data improved with less students absent 10% or more days. This was in large part a result of the GET position, funded by Title I. The GET monitors attendance, makes parent contact, and conducts home visits as needed in an effort to ensure students are present at school.

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

Areas of concern are the number of 4th grade students who scored a level 1 on statewide ELA and Math assessments. Those students are now 5th grade and also had high numbers of course failures in ELA and Math. This points to an increased need for targeted intervention and progress monitoring in ELA and Math.

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

Our highest priorities are to address the needs of our lowest quartile students in 3rd - 5th grades in the areas of ELA and Math. This includes the priority of addressing the needs of our ELL population. In addition to implementing an effective extended hour program, we will need to implement small group instruction within the classroom for both reading and math. Another priority will be to utilize Title I interventionists to deliver targeted small group ELA interventions when pushing into the reading block. Progress monitoring of interventions will an essential priority.

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 Early Warning System

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

When students feel accepted, motivated, and supported, they are more likely to succeed academically. Our Economically Disadvantaged subgroup shows 214 students with at least 1 risk flag and the Hispanic subgroup shows 128 students with at least 1 risk flag. Of our 3rd - 5th lowest quartile ELA students, 72 (33%) of them are LY. Of our 3rd - 5th lowest quartile Math students, 81 (37%) of them are LY. SWD - there are 79 students with at least 1 risk flag.45 SWD students are in the ELA lowest quartile and 36 are in the lowest Math quartile. BLK - there are 92 students with at least 1 risk flag. 33 BLK students are in the lowest quartile for ELA, and 45 are in the lowest quartile for math. MUL - there is no data in the risk flag report as these students are factored into the other subgroups.

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

Prine will provide ELLs with bilingual support and additional interventions and create a positive school culture which sets high academic expectations for all students, including students in the following subgroups: ELLs, BLK, SWD and MUL. 70% of the students in these subgroups in 3rd - 5th grade lowest quartile in ELA and Math will demonstrate learning gains as measured by an increase in overall scale score on 2023FAST PM1 ELA and Math to the 2024 FAST PM3 ELA and Math.

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

ELLs are encouraged to make incremental improvements in their language skills. Student ELL data will be monitored during weekly PLC meetings with 3rd - 5th grade teams. In addition, ELLevation will be used for LY Progress monitoring and strategies. FAST scores PM1, 2, and 3 will be reviewed for instructional and intervention implications. Students in the SWD, BLK, and MUL subgroups will be monitored during weekly PLC meetings and during MTSS data reviews with teachers and the MTSS teams every 4 weeks. InTandem, Lexia, SRA Mastery, Magnetics, Envision, and First in Math will be used as supplemental resources during EH, Title I Intervention support, and during morning math tutoring.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Greg Sander (sanderg@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.)

Imagine Language and Literacy (ELL students with 2.9 or below ACCESS score, new ELLs)
Lexia Core5
InTandem
First in Math
Magnetics
SRA Mastery

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

Imagine Language and Literacy has a promising rating according to the Evidence for ESSA website. In Tandem is an explicit, systematic, and multisensory phonics program grounded in the Science of Reading. In Tandem incorporates all four recommendations in the Foundational Skills to Support reading for Understanding in Kindergarten - 3rd grade IES Guide. Lexia Core5 is grounded in the Science of Reading.

This program shows strong ESSA evidence and a strong correlation between the end of level Core5 and ELA FSA scores for 3rd - 5th grades.

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.

ESOL para schedule for classroom support
Title I Intervention teachers push in, pull out
Teacher led small group ELA & Math lessons

Person Responsible: Greg Sander (sanderg@manateeschools.net)

By When: August 31, 2023

Weekly PLC grade level meetings to discuss student data and determine and deliver professional learning needs
MTSS meetings - every 4 weeks

Person Responsible: Mary Cooke (cookem2@manateeschools.net)

By When: 23-24 school year

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group 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.

Small group instruction within the reading block will increase students ability to read and comprehend grade level texts. Small group instruction provides personalized attention to address individual reading strengths and weaknesses, allows teachers to differentiate their materials and instruction, offers and opportunity for feedback, and increases student engagement. Peer interactions and targeted interventions are other benefits of small group instruction. Our Economically Disadvantaged subgroup shows 214 students with at least 1 risk flag and the Hispanic subgroup shows 128 students with at least 1 risk flag. Of our 3rd - 5th lowest quartile ELA students, 72 (33%) of them are LY. Of our 3rd - 5th lowest quartile Math students, 81 (37%) of them are LY. SWD - there are 79 students with at least 1 risk flag.45 SWD students are in the ELA lowest quartile and 36 are in the lowest Math quartile. BLK - there are 92 students with at least 1 risk flag. 33 BLK students are in the lowest quartile for ELA, and 45 are in the lowest quartile for math. MUL - there is no data in the risk flag report as these students are factored into the other subgroups.

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

By the end of May 2024, 60% of K-2 students will score at or above proficiency as measured by PM3 FAST ELA. By the end of May 2024, 60% of 3rd - 5th grade students will score at or above proficiency as measured by PM3 FAST Math. 70% of the students in the subgroups of ELL, SWD, BLK, and MUL in 3rd - 5th grade lowest quartile in ELA and Math will demonstrate learning gains as measured by an increase in overall scale score on 2023FAST PM1 ELA and Math to the 2024 FAST PM3 ELA and Math.

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

Small group instruction will be monitored during classroom walk throughs and grade level PLC meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Mary Cooke (cookem2@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.)

InTandem and Lexia Core5 will be used for small group instruction. Benchmark Advance Differentiated Tier 2 lessons will also be utilized. Morning tutoring for math will utilize First in Math for fact fluency and small group teacher led lessons will include Envision reteach lessons.

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

Benchmark Advance Differentiated Tier 2 lessons has moderate ESSA evidence.
Lexia Core5 has strong ESSA evidence
In Tandem has moderate and strong ESSA evidence.
Lexia Core5 and InTandem are grounded in the Science of Reading. Benchmark Intervention components provided scaffolded instruction at the grade level and mirror the grade level pacing components.

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.

Classroom walk throughs

Person Responsible: Mary Cooke (cookem2@manateeschools.net)

By When: 23-24 school year

PLC weekly grade level meetings

Person Responsible: Mary Cooke (cookem2@manateeschools.net)

By When: 23-24 school year

#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.

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

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

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.)

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

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

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).

ELLs, SWDs, Black, and Multiracial students are the subgroups of students at Prine below 41%. Funding to improve instructional practices and progress monitoring are two specific expenditures that will improve student achievement for students in these subgroups. In addition, four ESOL paraprofessionals provide support in classrooms.

A comprehensive needs assessment was done in the spring of 2023. The budget expenditures aligned with the CNA. The 22-23 SIP and PM2 data was reviewed with stakeholders during spring of 2023. As a result, funding to improve instructional practices, provide additional classroom support, and increase progress monitoring was based on needs. Prine will implement the planned initiatives and strategies to address the identified needs. Regular review of data to assess the impact of resource allocations on student outcomes will occur during SBLT and PLC meetings.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

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

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

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

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

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

Students in grades K-5 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.

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

Students in grades K-5 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 ELA Spring FAST, 50% or more of students in grades K-5 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 K-5 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, PLCs, and TCTs, to monitor progress toward school improvement.

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

Sander, Greg, sanderg@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, guided reading, SRA, 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
All action steps for Benchmark-aligned Instruction also apply to the RAISE Area of Focus, specifically strengthening systems to monitor Tier 1 instruction and building teacher capacity through coaching for accelerated improvement. InTandem, Accaletics and Extended Hour program and Title I intervention programs address the school's areas of focus. School teams will participate in and implement the professional development provided by the State Regional Literacy Directors to improve early literacy instruction. The instructional coach will participate in monthly coaches' academy aligned to the BSI Coaching for Accelerated Improvement.	Sander, Greg, sanderg@manateeschools.net
Literacy Leadership Lexia Core5 will be implemented K-5. Intervention lessons will be delivered via small group lessons. Student progress will be reviewed during PLC grade level meetings. Reports will be reviewed during ILT meeting.	Cooke, Mary, cookem2@manateeschools.net
Professional Learning During PLC grade level meetings, instructional methods for small group instruction and management will be delivered. This cycle will include data review for small group instructional implications for reading and writing.	Cooke, Mary, cookem2@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.

The SIP is posted on the school webpage. The SIP is also reviewed during SAC meetings and PLC grade level meetings as it relates to progress monitoring of schoolwide data.https://www.manateeschools.net/prine

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))

The school utilizes multiple channels for parent communication including email, newsletters, Connect Ed, Dojo, and Facebook. Parent teacher conferences provide opportunities for face to face discussions about students' progress. Parent and Family Engagement opportunities provide parents with the chance

to learn ways to support learning at home. Parents also build self-efficacy skills by learning strategies for supporting homework, classwork, and students' performance on assessments. They can participate in their child's education in a non-threatening, fun, interactive way. SAC is another way the school can build partnerships with parents. The school and parents meet to discuss programs, policies, and initiatives. Stakeholder representation ensures diverse perspectives are considered.

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))

Areas of Focus 1 and 2
The school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school in the following ways:
small group instruction
ELL support within the classroom
improving academics by creating a supporting positive culture and environment to address learning needs
accelerated learning through extended hour, accelerated math, and Accaletics.

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))

ESOL programs fall under Title III, ESSA which specifically addresses language instruction for English learners.

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))

Prine has two school counselors, a social worker, and a GET. These individuals work alongside families to provide support to meet the families' needs.

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).

Prine utilizes a tiered behavior model with RTI-B. The CHAMPS program is used as tier 1. The SSS works through the IST process to track behavioral data for students receiving tier 2 and 3 behavioral interventions.

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))

Prine offers a mentoring program for new teachers and teachers new to Prine. They meet bi-weekly with the instructional coach and Title I Intervention Team as well as grade level leaders. Teachers in their first 2 years of teaching meet bi-weekly with the team. Both groups focus on lesson planning, building relationships with students and families, and classroom management. All teachers participate in weekly PLC grade level meetings which include data analysis, professional learning, review of student work, lesson planning, and intervention planning.

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))

Preschool students that transition to kindergarten at Prine are reviewed during transition meetings between the sending and receiving school.

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Small Group Instruction	$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: -- Select below --:	$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