
Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Gilbert W Mcneal Elementary School

6325 LORRAINE RD, Lakewood Ranch, FL 34202

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

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.

Gilbert W. McNeal Elementary promotes action-minded leaders by setting goals and embedding the seven habits of happy kids every day.

Our mantra is: I will be respectful, I will be responsible, and I will be wild about learning. We have integrated technology in every aspect of instruction. We are continuing our work in empowering leadership and strengthening our school culture and climate. We will continue our "Leader In Me" Lighthouse journey with continued training during the 2023-2024 school year. These last six years we embarked on the 7 Habits of Happy Kids by Sean Covey to enhance our school climate and culture. We strive to empower our students as they will become McNeal Wildcat Leaders and utilize Data Binders and participate in creating action teams and write Wildly Important Goals (WIGS).

Provide the school's vision statement.

Vision Statement: Wildcats are shining bright using leadership habits, critical-thinking skills and problem-solving methods to make a difference in the world.

Gilbert W. McNeal is a STEAM school where integration of Science, Technology, Engineering, Arts, and Math are a focus. Our Mantra is: Be Respectful, Be Responsible, Be WILD about Learning! We are in our seventh year as a Leader In Me and our first year as a Lighthouse Accredited school during the 2023-2024 school year. We will continue to Shine Bright as a Lighthouse school in all that we do within our school community and reaching beyond our community through our service projects.

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
Waid, Sheila	Principal	<p>The role of the principal is to influence two fundamental goals: increase student achievement and student safety.</p> <p>Manages the Instructional Leadership Team Budgets the instructional and cultural resources Analyzes class and grade level data Purposeful instructional walks to ensure fidelity</p>
Terry, Ashley	Assistant Principal	<p>The role of the assistant principal is to influence two fundamental goals: increase student achievement and student safety.</p> <p>Analyzes class and grade level data Purposeful instructional walks to ensure fidelity</p>
Matazinski, Lillian	Dean	<p>Lillian Matazinski - Student Support Specialist</p> <p>The role of our SSS is to monitor and gather school discipline data as well as support staff for any discipline issues. She supports our students by forming relationships with them and advocating for them so that they may be successful in the classroom.</p>
Padgett, Nancy Alex	School Counselor	<p>The role of our school counselor is to monitor Tier 2 and Tier 3 students and disseminate school wide data to the team in partnership with administration.</p>
Spence, Jessica	Teacher, K-12	<p>Our grade level leaders disseminate information from the leadership team to their grade level teams. These leaders also problem solve strategies to increase student achievement and brainstorm solutions to school-wide issues that arise. They each co-facilitate on the school's professional learning communities and communicate to the leadership team successes, concerns, or needs.</p>

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.

In May 2023, we sent two different surveys: one to the parents and one to our staff to collect information about their concerns, priorities, etc.

We discuss monthly with our stakeholders our goals for our school improvement plan and we discuss our results as we are working towards our goals throughout the school year.

Teachers and staff give their input for our SIP during our Instructional Leadership Team meetings as well as our Team and Staff meetings. We have monthly data chats with grade level teams to review data and analyze how we are progressing towards meeting our SIP goals.

SIP Monitoring

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

McNeal's SIP will be monitoring through informal walks, formal observations as well as monthly data meetings with grade level teams. We update our stakeholders at our monthly SAC meetings.

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

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	27%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	21%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	16	15	10	10	19	12	0	0	0	82
One or more suspensions	0	7	3	0	0	6	0	0	0	16
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	12	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	10	0	0	0	0	12
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	2	4	1	3	7	0	0	0	0	17
	1	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	5

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	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2

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

Prior Year (2022-23) 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	29	12	16	24	16	16	0	0	0	113
One or more suspensions	3	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	4	5	4	0	0	0	13
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	3	2	3	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	11	16	8	0	0	0	35
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	10	11	10	0	0	0	31
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	4	5	4	6	0	0	0	19

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	11	9	7	0	0	0	27

The number of students identified retained:

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

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	29	12	16	24	16	16	0	0	0	113
One or more suspensions	3	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	4	5	4	0	0	0	13
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	3	2	3	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	11	16	8	0	0	0	35
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	10	11	10	0	0	0	31
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	4	5	4	6	0	0	0	19

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	11	9	7	0	0	0	27

The number of students identified retained:

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

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*	74	51	53	80	55	56	81		
ELA Learning Gains				63			76		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				44			58		
Math Achievement*	80	62	59	80	50	50	82		
Math Learning Gains				74			80		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				54			65		
Science Achievement*	77	51	54	71	65	59	83		
Social Studies Achievement*					66	64			
Middle School Acceleration					51	52			
Graduation Rate					52	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	62	59	59	83					

* 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	74
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	371
Total Components for the Federal Index	5

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	69
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	549
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	48			
ELL	46			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	47			
HSP	81			
MUL	81			
PAC				
WHT	77			
FRL	64			

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	51			
ELL	78			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	52			
HSP	76			
MUL	73			
PAC				
WHT	67			
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	74			80			77					62
SWD	50			50			37				4	
ELL	25			50							3	62
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	43			50							2	
HSP	79			85			67				4	
MUL	81			81							2	
PAC												
WHT	75			80			80				4	
FRL	65			65			61				4	

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	80	63	44	80	74	54	71					83
SWD	50	42	26	59	71	58	50					
ELL	67	82		75	82							83
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	42	44		54	69	50	50					
HSP	85	72		77	76		70					
MUL	69			77								
PAC												
WHT	83	63	41	83	73	52	72					
FRL	63	56	38	58	53	35	47					

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	81	76	58	82	80	65	83					
SWD	49	83		59	83		91					
ELL	91			100								
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	57			57								
HSP	85	86		85	79		82					
MUL	82			82								
PAC												
WHT	83	73	63	84	79	70	83					
FRL	66	62	46	61	59	54	68					

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	74%	53%	21%	54%	20%
04	2023 - Spring	84%	54%	30%	58%	26%
03	2023 - Spring	78%	47%	31%	50%	28%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	79%	62%	17%	59%	20%
04	2023 - Spring	82%	64%	18%	61%	21%
05	2023 - Spring	83%	61%	22%	55%	28%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	77%	49%	28%	51%	26%

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.

Proficiency with our Students with Disabilities
 SWD's in ELA 63% (Goal is 65%)
 SWD's in Math 57% (Goal is 60%)
 SWD's in Science 44% (Goal is 50%)

A contributing factor is having all the reading and math blocks on the master schedule during the same time. For this year, we have spread out the reading blocks so our ESE Resource teachers can effectively push into classrooms for support.

Our Science improved by 7% overall but we still have room for improvement. Our ESE proficiency for Science was only 44% so much room for improvement. We are departmentalizing this year with 3 fifth grade teachers per team - 1 1/2 hours for ELA, 1 1/2 hours for Math, 1 1/2 hours for Science and Acaletics. This will allow for more concentration for Science as well as allowing for ESE Resource teachers to push in during blocks. We will also begin tutoring during FA at the end of Quarter 1 instead of waiting until Jan.

Our overall letter grade for ESE students moved from a "C" to a "B" so what we put in place this last year worked but with a couple more focused changes, we will be able to get our SWDs to an "A"

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

Our 5th grade reading has the greatest decline with a decrease in proficiency from 82% to 74%. 3 teachers looped from 4th to 5th grade which left the other students to split between 2 classrooms and 3 teachers in 5th grade who had no experience teaching the grade level.

There was a large number of ESE students as well and our ESE students did not perform well. My ESE Resource teacher was out for 32 days as well.

Another contributing factor is having all the reading blocks on the master schedule during the same time. For this year, we have spread out the reading blocks so our ESE Resource teachers can effectively push into classrooms for support.

We also only had 1 teacher on the team that wished to tutor students during FA. Our 3rd and 4th grade teachers all tutored students so I strongly believe not having that extra support for 4 months with our fifth grade students made a difference.

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.

We do not necessarily have a gap with the state or the district but we do have a definite gap in our younger grades with math. Our kindergarten and first grade have expected growth of 67% or higher while our 2nd grade students are pulling 59% expected growth rates. This is something to watch this year while we are doing our walks in 2nd grade as well as 3rd grade during math blocks and when we analyze the data during our data chats.

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

Our greatest improvement was with 5th grade Science. The admin team did focused walks during Science and Reading along with taking time to analyze and provide important and immediate feedback. Our team collaborated and utilized the feedback to improve classroom instruction and environments. We aligned data with our walks as well as observations.

We also had Susan Smucker come assist with Science twice during the school year which was very helpful to all of the teachers especially since 3 teachers had not taught 5th grade before or experienced the Science Assessment.

We were able to give more individual support to students by having our para professionals push into the classrooms during Science instruction as well.

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

We have 27 students that have 2 or more indicators - 11 students in third grade, 9 students in fourth grade, and 7 students in fifth grade. We need a solid plan for these students and everyone in the school needs to be aware of these students.

Attendance and substantial reading deficiency are the areas of most concern for these 27 students.

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

1. Increase proficiency with our Students with Disabilities in ELA, Math, and Science
2. Increase our Science proficiency overall
3. Improve our ELL proficiency in ELA and Math
4. Improve our culture of our school encouraging attendance and improving behavior by using CHAMPS

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.

ELL subgroup - We have 39 countries represented within our population, which means that our students were born in 39 different countries. Therefore, we have many different languages spoken from our very diverse population. We celebrate this diversity each year for Heritage Day and we must be sure that our ELL students are progressing in their academics as well as socially and emotionally. We have a diverse staff population as well and wish to continue using our staff to mentor this population of students.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We want 90% of our ELL students to participate in our Heritage Day / Leadership Day activities this year by sharing their culture during our programs throughout the school year. Our staff will mentor this population and continue to invest their time sharing with these students to support them in all they do in our school community. This is beneficial to our staff/teachers as well as our students. We also wish for our ELL population to increase their proficiency in Math and ELA to 75%.

Monitoring:

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

Administration will monitor the students participating in the school wide events during the school year. Teachers and staff will help to encourage participation by all ELL students. Administration will monitor the staff/teachers mentoring these students and support where it is needed. Administration with fidelity checks for ELL strategies through focus based walks and / or observations. We will monitor data monthly during our grade level data chats. Administration analyzing Imagine emails weekly and ensuring ELL students minutes are met.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Sheila Waid (waid@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.)

We will use a Focus Based strategy learned in the Brian Dassel Leadership Academy before any walks or observations specifically looking for ELL strategies being used to assist students. The foundational ideas are based on common language for high quality instruction and knowing how to lead for that. There are four dimensions of instructional leadership: Vision/Mission, Improvement of Instructional Practice, Allocation of Resources, and Management of systems and processes. We will monitor the Imagine Learning program and be sure that students are using this researched based program with fidelity.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Targeted feedback cycles create purpose such as: focus and creates outcomes for observations and conversations. Teacher and leader work together to decide when evidence is related to area of focus. Feedback is based on collaborative conversations with instruction and student learning as the context with factual feedback - (what you see and what you hear).

We also invested in the training in Orton-Gillingham with our two ESE resource teachers and a 2nd grade teacher. We plan to train 4 more teachers during this school year.

We also invested in training 6 staff members on SIPPS and purchasing 5 more SIPP kits for grade levels to use during Tiered intervention time - WIN (What I Need).

Resources: SIPPS, Spalding Phonemic Awareness, UFLI Foundations, Social Stories, AR Comprehension and Vocabulary tests

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.

Person Responsible: Sheila Waid (waid@manateeschools.net)

By When: May 2024

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.

Person Responsible: Sheila Waid (waid@manateeschools.net)

By When: May 2024

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.

Person Responsible: Sheila Waid (waid@manateeschools.net)

By When: May 2024

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.

Person Responsible: Sheila Waid (waid@manateeschools.net)

By When: May 2024

#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.

The Area of Focus was determined from analyzing many data pieces, but specifically last year's State FAST Data. We need to increase our proficiency in all subject areas for all students but specifically our ESE population.

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, Math, and Science proficiency will increase by 10% or more as measured by 2024 Spring FAST. This expected growth is applied to all students at each grade level and for each ESSA subgroup to meet or exceed 41% proficient. The aim is to effectively scaffold students' mastery of benchmarks while closing achievement gaps for non-proficient students.

Monitoring:

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

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

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Sheila Waid (waid@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.

Person Responsible: Sheila Waid (waid@manateeschools.net)

By When: May of 2024

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.

Person Responsible: Sheila Waid (waid@manateeschools.net)

By When: May of 2024

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.

Person Responsible: Sheila Waid (waid@manateeschools.net)

By When: May of 2024

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.

Person Responsible: Sheila Waid (waid@manateeschools.net)

By When: May of 2024

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

Person Responsible: Sheila Waid (waid@manateeschools.net)

By When: May of 2024

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

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