Sea Breeze Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Sea Breeze Elementary School

3601 71ST ST W, Bradenton, FL 34209

https://www.manateeschools.net/seabreeze

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.

Sea Breeze Elementary School strives to maintain high expectations and promote academic excellence for all students by creating a positive school climate which respects and values diversity and nurtures self-esteem.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Sea Breeze Elementary School values all our students and diversity. Communication among all stakeholders is important to support high academic standards.

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
Bovoletis, Aliki	Principal	
Shapiro, Samantha	Reading Coach	
Blackmore, Todd	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.

The ILT team is a group that represents all stake holders: including a paraprofessional, ESE member, primary teacher, intermediate teacher, counselor, reading coach, fine arts and behavior expert. Data was presented to the ILT team for review and input on the SIP goals and strategies. From the ILT input and discussions the SIP goals were finalized. Data was presented to SAC at the end of the 22-23 school year and the school's next steps were discussed. The draft SIP will be presented and voted on during the September SAC meeting.

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

The SIP will be monitored quarterly through ILT,SAC and at TCT monthly meetings. Based on data and our sub groups the SIP can be revised as necessary.

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	61%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) 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: B
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	24	21	23	21	15	17	0	0	0	121
One or more suspensions	2	2	3	7	2	7	0	0	0	23
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	31	4	17	0	0	0	52
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	26	15	23	0	0	0	64
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	30	21	23	0	0	0	74
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	27	19	24	0	0	0	70
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	6	21	29	35	23	0	0	0	114

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	2	0	2	27	30	23	0	0	0	84

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	7
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	33	40	39	29	23	24	0	0	0	188
One or more suspensions	11	27	14	10	7	23	0	0	0	92
Course failure in ELA	0	38	20	27	10	40	0	0	0	135
Course failure in Math	0	28	12	35	16	25	0	0	0	116
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	28	14	21	0	0	0	63
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	24	10	17	0	0	0	51
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	14	28	27	24	25	0	0	0	118

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	22	10	27	14	25	0	0	0	98

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	7
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	33	40	39	29	23	24	0	0	0	188
One or more suspensions	11	27	14	10	7	23	0	0	0	92
Course failure in ELA	0	38	20	27	10	40	0	0	0	135
Course failure in Math	0	28	12	35	16	25	0	0	0	116
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	28	14	21	0	0	0	63
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	24	10	17	0	0	0	51
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	14	28	27	24	25	0	0	0	118

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	22	10	27	14	25	0	0	0	98

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	7
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*	47	51	53	44	55	56	44		
ELA Learning Gains				51			40		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				55			44		
Math Achievement*	49	62	59	55	50	50	49		
Math Learning Gains				63			52		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				62			41		
Science Achievement*	49	51	54	44	65	59	47		
Social Studies Achievement*					66	64			
Middle School Acceleration					51	52			
Graduation Rate					52	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	72	59	59	44			30		

In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	52
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	261
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	52

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	418
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	26	Yes	1	1
ELL	44			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	32	Yes	1	
HSP	44			
MUL	47			
PAC				
WHT	63			
FRL	49			

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	41			
ELL	46			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	43			
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	57			
PAC				
WHT	62			
FRL	50			

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	47			49			49					72
SWD	21			21			8				5	54
ELL	39			45			27				5	72
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	32			35			30				4	
HSP	37			44			43				5	70
MUL	50			43							2	
PAC												
WHT	62			61			60				4	
FRL	43			42			43				5	74

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	44	51	55	55	63	62	44					44
SWD	20	45	45	34	58	69	20					36
ELL	40	40		53	54							44
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	28	38		37	67	60	27					
HSP	45	50	43	49	49	50	38					47
MUL	39	73		53	64							
PAC												
WHT	53	54		69	74		60					
FRL	39	47	55	54	65	64	36					41

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	44	40	44	49	52	41	47					30
SWD	19	28	45	27	33	40	0					9
ELL	37			37			40					30
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	38	35		39	44		50					
HSP	34	37		36	53		35					33
MUL	50			69								
PAC												
WHT	55	45		62	55		50					
FRL	39	31	42	43	46	43	39					23

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	49%	53%	-4%	54%	-5%
04	2023 - Spring	49%	54%	-5%	58%	-9%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	43%	47%	-4%	50%	-7%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	40%	62%	-22%	59%	-19%
04	2023 - Spring	61%	64%	-3%	61%	0%
05	2023 - Spring	46%	61%	-15%	55%	-9%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	47%	49%	-2%	51%	-4%

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.

Overall achievement in ELA showed the lowest performance rate, with a proficiency level of 48%. A note to keep in mind is that this was actually a 4% increase (44%) from the previous year. As individual grade levels, 3rd grade showed a 25% increase in proficiency from PM1-PM3 (18% to 43%). Third grade also showed a 7% increase in proficiency from 2021-2022 to 2022-2023 (36% to 43%). As for 4th grade, the student proficiency mark rose by 29% from PM1-PM3 (20% to 49%). However, there was a decrease in overall proficiency from 2021-2022 to 2022-2023 of 3% (52% to 49%). When looking longitudinally though, the 3rd graders in 2021-2022 had a proficiency rate of 36%, while that same group in 4th grade in 2022-2023 had a proficiency rate of 49%, which is an increase of 13%. Fifth grade students made a 28% increase in proficiency from PM1-PM2 (21% to 49%) in 2022-2023. A 5% increase in proficiency also took place from 2021-2022 to 2022-2023 (44% to 49%). Understandably there is the discussion about the two assessments (FSA, FAST) being different in make-up (PBT vs CBT), which inhibited the use of some fundamental student strategies. That being said, we believe that phonics and phonemic awareness instruction in the primary grades has, and will continue, to play a role in ELA proficiency in intermediate grades. We are going to continue to focus on improving and/or maintaining the quality of Tier I instruction for all students. We also are revamping our intervention block to be more productive in assessing student needs, and then providing high yielding, standards-based instructional strategies to fit those needs.

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

Overall achievement in Math saw a decline in proficiency of 5%, from 55% proficient in 2021-2022 to 50% proficient in 2022-2023. When viewing the individual grade levels, 3rd grade registered an increase in proficiency from PM1 to PM3 of 32% (8% to 40%). However, there was a decrease of 15% in proficiency in math for 3rd grade from 2021-2022 to 2022-2023 (55% to 40%). Fourth grade also saw an increase in proficiency from PM1 to PM2 of 39% in math and an increase of 1% in proficiency from 2021-2022 to 2022-2023 (60% to 61%). Again, looking longitudinally, these students increased in proficiency by 6% from their 3rd grade scores in 2021-2022 to their 4th grade scores in 2022-2023 (55% to 61%). Fifth grade saw a 37% increase from PM1 to PM3 in 2022-2023 (9% to 46%) but a decrease from 2021-2022 to 2022-2023 of 3% (49% to 46%). As a longitudinal look, this group of students decreased from 60% proficiency in fourth grade (2021-2022) to 46% proficiency as fifth graders in 2022-2023, which reads as a fall of 14%. As previously mentioned, the different dynamics of the assessments used could have very well played a role in this, as a big picture generalization. In essence, we have observed that a continued decline in basic math facts (particularly multiplication and division) is definitely a factor. Also in consideration is the inability of students to distinguish and remove "distractor" answers within multiple choice questions. This is also predominant in our data from Acaletics.

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.

Without question, the greatest gap when compared to state averages lies within 3rd grade scores from 2022-2023. The gap for ELA proficiency is 7% (50% to 43%) from state to school, and the gap for math proficiency from state to school is 19% (59% to 40%). As previously mentioned, the different assessment style is believed to play a role, as is the fact that 3rd grade was that group of students' first exposure to that type of testing, in general. More specifically, the lack of inherent knowledge and immediate recall of basic math facts played a role. Along with that is the confusion caused by the language within the word problems themselves, including the aforementioned inability to recognize and rule out "distractor" answers.

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

Our largest area of improvement came in Science achievement, with a 5% increase in proficiency from 2021-2022 to 2022-2023 (44% up to 49%). A continuation of the STEM program combined with a rejuvinated approach to looking at grade level EOY expectations were put into place. Grade level teachers collaborated with our STEM teacher to ensure instructional effectiveness and fidelity. Tier I instructional strategies were bolstered, particularly in 5th grade, in order to accomplish this task.

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

Attendance at Title I schools is historically a concern. Our Graduation Enhancement Technician (GET) performs daily follow-up with families whose students have attendance difficulties. The communication between school and home definitely helps. The more prevalent concerns are ultimately linked and related, those being number of courses failed, number of students proficient, and, in particular, number of students demonstrating a deficiency in reading. The collective number of courses failed bears a striking resemblance to the number of students not showing proficiency across each grade level. This is why we are placing an increased emphasis on solidifying specific and purposeful Tier I instructional strategies. Ideally, this will shrink the number of students needing Tier II/III instruction and thereby also reduce the number of students with deficiencies in reading. Instruction for students still needing Tier II/III support will also be reviewed for efficiency and effectiveness. These reviews will take place both during and in between formal progress monitoring windows.

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

1. High Quality Tier 1 Instruction
2. Increasing student achievement in ELA to 50% proficiency
3. Increase student achievement in Math to 50% proficiency
4. Increase writing achievement in 4th and 5th grade to an average score of 3
5. Increase staff retention by creating a positive school climate

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

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

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

School climate is key in reducing teacher stress and improving teacher retention. Teachers and instructional support staff want to feel respected and valued for their role in the school community. While you may not be able to reduce the workload, you can create a better school climate for all.
There are four areas of focus:
Physical safety
Emotional support
Academic support
Social relationships

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 2023-24 school year Sea Breeze will retain 90% or more of the current staff.

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

Teacher retention will be monitored through the following methods:
Two surveys sent to all staff to gather staff feedback.
An Administrator survey.
Resignations, transfers, and vacancies.
Throughout the school year, the school will focus on ensuring that staff feel safe, both physically and emotionally. This includes:
Discussing student discipline and physical building safety through TAT meetings and IST evidence through meeting minutes.
Building relationships with staff through team builders and staff recognition.
Providing positive feedback and open communication.
Offering academic support through collaborative planning, coaching, and an admin assigned to each team for support and training. Evidence will be provided through a teams graphic organizer.
The school is committed to providing a supportive and professional environment for all staff, and these measures are designed to help ensure that teachers feel valued and appreciated.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Aliki Bovoletis (bovoletisa@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.)

Appreciative Inquiry

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

Appreciative Inquiry (AI) is a strengths-based approach to organizational change that focuses on identifying and building on the positive aspects of an organization. It is a process that involves asking questions that help people to focus on what is working well and what they want to see more of.

There are several reasons why AI is a good approach to use when interacting with staff members in an education setting. First, it can help to create a more positive and supportive work environment. When people feel appreciated and valued, they are more likely to be engaged and motivated in their work.

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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

1. Creating a survey to send to staff to receive feedback on school culture and school climate.
2. Creating a committee to plan quarterly staff team building activities.
3. Using CHAMPS with fidelity to ensure a safe learning environment.
4. ILT planning staff recognition opportunities.
5. Using mentor teachers to support new staff.
6. Providing opportunities for collaborative planning and professional development to support academics.

Person Responsible: Aliki Bovoletis (bovoletisa@manateeschools.net)

By When: This will be completed by the end of the 2023-24 School Year. 1. School survey September and May 2. Created in August and will be used through out the school year. 3. CHAMPS was communicated in August with Monthly fidelity checks 4. Staff Recognition weekly 5. Mentor teachers established in August and meet monthly 6. Collaborative planning-weekly starting in Auguste

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned Instruction

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

To increase accountability for learning among all students and increase proficiency in ELA and Math, staff will be delivering high quality Tier 1 instruction. Tier 1 is the most important level of support. It meets the needs of the greatest number of students with diverse learning needs.

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

If Tier I instruction is aligned to the rigor of the benchmarks, scaffolded to address individualized students' needs, and designed to increase accountability for learning among all students, then ELA and Math proficiency will increase to 50% or more students assessed as proficient as measured by 2024 Spring FAST. This expected growth is applied to all students at each grade level. The aim is to effectively scaffold students' mastery of benchmarks while closing achievement gaps for non-proficient students.

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

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

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Aliki Bovoletis (bovoletisa@manateeschools.net)

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

Florida's Multi-Tiered System of Support

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

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

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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

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

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

2. 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.

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

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

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

Person Responsible: Aliki Bovoletis (bovoletisa@manateeschools.net)

By When: This will be completed by the end of the 2023-24 school year. 1. Collaborative Planning - Weekly starting in August 2.Look fors were created in May of 22 and communicated to staff in August 3.Needs assessment was creates and discussed with the Admin team and plan was created - July 4. Calendar of events was created and communicated in August 5.MTSS Framework was communicated and implemented starting in August with quarterly fidelity checks.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

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

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

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

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

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

Students in grades K-2 will receive direct and explicit instruction 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 3-5 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-2 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 3-5 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.

Shapiro, Samantha, shapiros@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
School teams will participate in and implement the professional development provided by the Reading Coach to improve early literacy instruction. The instructional coach will participate in monthly coaches' academy aligned to the BSI Coaching for Accelerated Improvement.	Shapiro, Samantha, shapiros@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 will be communicated to all staff through email, ILT, staff meetings and data meetings. The SIP will be revisited three times a year. A finalized SIP plan will be posted on our school website and presented at a SAC meeting. An agenda of the SAC meeting will be communicated to parents and community members through Dojo, Facebook, and a Connect Ed call out.

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))

Sea Breeze will build positive relationships with parents by having open communication through Dojo, Facebooks, Connect Ed calls, positive student phone calls in the first 30 days, and answers for concerns within 24 hours. Sea Breeze communicates student progress through conferences, progress reports, deficiency letters, report cards and communicating test results three times a year. The school will hold four parent engagement events throughout the year, with each event focusing on something different. For example; math and science, ELA, test prep, and the arts. We will also hold a holiday concert and walk-a-thon including business partners.

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))

If Tier I instruction is aligned to the rigor of the benchmarks, scaffolded to address individualized students' needs, and designed to increase accountability for learning among all students, then ELA and Math proficiency will increase to 50% or more proficient as measured by 2024 Spring FAST. This expected growth is applied to all students at each grade level. The aim is to effectively scaffold students' mastery of benchmarks while closing achievement gaps for non-proficient students.

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

At Sea Breeze Elementary School all students receive a free breakfast and lunch that meets Florida's nutritional guidelines. The school also works closely with the Early Learning Coalition to help prepare our youngest students for school and to become life long 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))

The school counselors use Xello to help ensure student metal health is good. We use one on one services with parent consent, class presentations, social groups, and CHAMPS to provide strategies and to improve students social skills. If parents request resource the school has a variety of resources to provide them assistance from food to school supplies.

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))

n/a

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).

An effective MTSS framework has the following components: (1) Strong, high-quality classroom instruction for all students; (2) Use of assessment data to measure and monitor academic/behavior progress; (3) Identification of at-risk students; (4) Targeted, evidenced-based interventions; and (5) Routine collaboration of school teams to determine when and where coaching and training are needed for improved learning outcomes.
The MTSS framework is used for both academic and for behavior. Academics is reviewed monthly in TCT and IST meetings. Behavior is reviewed at monthly TAT meetings and IST.

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))

Staff has opportunities for professional learning through district training. Trainings include, but are not limited to, academics, behavior support, and technology. We use our staff to model and teach strategies to other staff through mini-PD sessions held throughout the year. We use data to plan instruction monthly. The school facilitates two all-day planning sessions to review data, deliver PD, and collaboratively plan to improve instruction and achievement.

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))

Sea Breeze has four Pre-Kindergarten classes. We use the same school, rules, procedures, CHAMPS and include Pre-K student in all events. We encourage parents to patriciate in SOAR in 4, a monthly resource event focusing on early literacy. We hold end of the year meetings to create plans to transition students into Kindergarten. Parents receive progress reports, reading bags and resources to help them support their students learning including activities to strengthen social skills.

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: Teacher Retention and Recruitment	$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Benchmark-aligned Instruction	$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