Jessie P. Miller Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Jessie P. Miller Elementary School

601 43RD ST W, Bradenton, FL 34209

https://www.manateeschools.net/miller

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 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
Riley, Debra	Principal	Lead the school with the mission and vision in mind.
Deleo, Kimberly	Assistant Principal	Lead the school with the mission/vision in mind.
Potter, Katelyn	Dean	Provide behavior support to students.
Watkins, Jodi	Instructional Coach	Provide instructional support to teachers.
Westendorf, Michelle	Teacher, K-12	Team leader and teacher leader within the school.
Morris, Amy	Teacher, ESE	Team leader. Leads MTSS and IST.

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 school leadership team collaborates to discuss/complete the SIP plan. The plan is shared with staff, parents and the SAC committee.

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 plan drives all decisions made to improve student learning and improvement. FAST assessment data is closely monitored throughout the year. Response to this data occurs when data suggests a need.

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	53%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	72%
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: B 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 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	0	22	29	30	29	25	0	0	0	135
One or more suspensions	0	1	5	8	8	9	0	0	0	31
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	1	5	28	32	9	0	0	0	75
Course failure in Math	0	5	4	17	24	15	0	0	0	65
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	19	16	22	21	20	0	0	0	98
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	27	4	20	15	22	0	0	0	88
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	8	14	8	10	11	0	0	0	51

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	10	10	3	0	0	0	23

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	11	0	0	0	0	0	11
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	37	45	39	40	34	34	0	0	0	229
One or more suspensions	4	4	2	3	5	2	0	0	0	20
Course failure in ELA	2	16	9	11	4	4	0	0	0	46
Course failure in Math	1	2	7	12	8	7	0	0	0	37
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	26	30	8	0	0	0	64
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	26	25	12	0	0	0	63
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	3	9	15	0	0	0	0	0	27

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	3	13	9	7	5	5	0	0	0	42

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	11	0	0	0	0	0	11
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	37	45	39	40	34	34	0	0	0	229
One or more suspensions	4	4	2	3	5	2	0	0	0	20
Course failure in ELA	2	16	9	11	4	4	0	0	0	46
Course failure in Math	1	2	7	12	8	7	0	0	0	37
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	26	30	8	0	0	0	64
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	26	25	12	0	0	0	63
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	3	9	15	0	0	0	0	0	27

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	3	13	9	7	5	5	0	0	0	42

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	11	0	0	0	0	0	11
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*	42	51	53	51	55	56	54		
ELA Learning Gains				52			48		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				45			29		
Math Achievement*	47	62	59	63	50	50	61		
Math Learning Gains				65			66		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				48			59		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	42	51	54	62	65	59	65		
Social Studies Achievement*					66	64			
Middle School Acceleration					51	52			
Graduation Rate					52	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	61	59	59	59			43		

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	48
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	241
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	56
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	445
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

ESSA Subgroup	2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY			
	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	18	Yes	1	1
ELL	33	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	27	Yes	1	1
HSP	39	Yes	1	
MUL	44			
PAC				
WHT	56			
FRL	43			

ESSA Subgroup	2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY			
	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	42			
ELL	47			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	45			
HSP	51			
MUL	50			
PAC				
WHT	62			
FRL	52			

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	42			47			42					61
SWD	12			26			19				4	
ELL	27			30			18				5	61
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	16			30			33				4	
HSP	37			35			22				5	58
MUL	44			44							2	
PAC												
WHT	52			59			57				4	
FRL	36			39			38				5	59

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	51	52	45	63	65	48	62					59
SWD	20	46	50	29	50	54	44					
ELL	38	65		38	50		30					59
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	32	40		49	63	45	40					
HSP	44	58	45	48	57	38	50					64
MUL	33	53		53	62							
PAC												
WHT	63	53	29	78	72	67	75					
FRL	44	53	49	58	59	35	50					67

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	54	48	29	61	66	59	65					43
SWD	27	45		35	45							53
ELL	38	45		46	50							43

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
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	24			39								
HSP	38	40		48	55		39					43
MUL	61			56								
PAC												
WHT	66	53	20	72	70	45	78					
FRL	44	40	31	53	63	73	55					48

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

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	40%	53%	-13%	54%	-14%
04	2023 - Spring	43%	54%	-11%	58%	-15%
03	2023 - Spring	45%	47%	-2%	50%	-5%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	59%	62%	-3%	59%	0%
04	2023 - Spring	48%	64%	-16%	61%	-13%
05	2023 - Spring	38%	61%	-23%	55%	-17%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	39%	49%	-10%	51%	-12%

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, ELA continues to be an area that needs to be improved upon across all grade levels. Last year was a year of change: new standards, new curriculum materials, etc. The ELA achievement dropped from 51% to 45%. In grades 3-5, 4th grade was the only one to increase achievement over the previous school year (2%). Grade 3 dropped 4% and Grade 5 dropped 20% from the previous school year. The 5th Grade students have had weak performance across all years from 3rd to 5th grade.

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

The 5th grade students have had low test scores and performance from year to year when tracking the data across grade levels. This year the 5th grade showed a decrease from the previous year in all three tested areas: ELA decrease 20%, Math decrease 34%, Science decrease 20%. This particular group of students was highly affected by loss of learning due to COVID. This group of students also experienced many teacher changes during their 4th grade year. These factors contributed to the decline seen in scores.

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.

5th Grade Math shows the greatest gap compared to the state average. As previously mentioned, this group of students struggled to show achievement on state tests. When they were in 3rd grade, they did not take the FSA. When they were in 4th grade, their math score was 54% which was below the state score of 61%. As 5th Grade students they scored 38% which was below the state average score of 55%. This group of students tends to show more learning gains which were not able to be calculated this year.

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

Our 4th Grade students showed a slight gain in ELA achievement this year. This improvement is attributed to having a greater level of consistency among the teachers at that grade level compared to the prior year. This group of teachers met regularly with the instructional coach to plan for instruction. Students were provided with acceleration opportunities as well as interventions based on specific need. Quarterly planning days allowed teachers to dig deep into the new benchmarks and carefully plan for instruction.

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

Potential areas of concern based on EWS data:
- student absences
- number of students scoring a Level 1 on PM3 of the FAST assessment

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

1. Increase the level of student achievement on the FAST assessment K-5.
2. Increase student attendance
3. Decrease the number of office discipline referrals by strengthening the PBS program.

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

#1. 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.

Miller Elementary dropped in school grade from a B to a C during the 22-23 school year. Strengthening the instructional practices of the teachers is a crucial need based on the data.

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

If Tier 1 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 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 the 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, PLC's and TCT's to monitor progress toward school improvement.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Debra Riley (rileyd@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, evidence-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.

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 tasks that

engage all students. Collaborative planning will also address remedial/accelerated instruction for small groups and provide opportunities for problem-solving, discussion of high effect practices, and ongoing data review.

Person Responsible: Jodi Watkins (watkinsj2@manateeschools.net)

By When: Quarterly planning days to conclude at the beginning of Q4.

Define 'Look Fors' related to high-quality instruction that are present every day, in every classroom, and for the benefit of every students to include: (1) Providing opportunities for students to collaborate; (2) Teachers providing explicit instruction aligned to benchmark and intended learning outcome; (3) Teachers ask students to write daily to deepen understanding of the intended learning; (4) Tasks provided are aligned to the intended learning and include conceptual understanding. 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: Debra Riley (rileyd@manateeschools.net)

By When: Ongoing throughout the course of the school year

Identify the instructional practices 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 support for improved teaching and learning.

Person Responsible: Kimberly Deleo (deleok@manateeschools.net)

By When: End of September 2023

Create a calendar of yearlong meeting structures to analyze student performance data, define key attributes of learners to address unique needs, and evaluate available resources best matched to student need.

Person Responsible: Debra Riley (rileyd@manateeschools.net)

By When: Calendar- August 2023 Data Analysis- ongoing as data presents

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

Person Responsible: Amy Morris (morris3a@manateeschools.net)

By When: August 2023

#2. 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.

In 21-22, there were a total of 286 office discipline referrals written over the course of the school year. In 22-23, the number of referrals increased by 143 to 429 office discipline referrals. In response to this increase, our Tier 1 PBIS framework has been reworked to refresh and improve the system.

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

By May 2024, the number of office discipline referrals for the year will decrease by a minimum of 10%.

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

Systems for monitoring the success of Tier 1 behavior data include (1) Monthly review of discipline data; (2) Regular classroom observations with feedback and coaching; (3) Multi-Tiered System of Support; and (4) regular team meetings to monitor progress toward school improvement.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Debra Riley (rileyd@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 instruction for all students; (2) Use of data to monitor behavior progress; (3) Identification of at-risk students; (4) Targeted, evidence-based interventions; (5) Routine collaboration of school teams to determine when/where coaching and training are needed for improving 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.

Review of current Tier 1 behavior plan to determine necessary changes needed to refresh/renew the PBIS system currently in place and develop a new PBIS Staff Handbook detailing components of the new plan

Person Responsible: Amy Morris (morris3a@manateeschools.net)

By When: August 2023

Provide PD to staff to rollout the new plan and explain how to implement the plan, the benefits of restructuring

Person Responsible: Amy Morris (morris3a@manateeschools.net)

By When: August 2023

Create a calendar of yearlong meeting structures to analyze student behavior data, to address unique needs and evaluate the available resources best matched to students' needs.

Person Responsible: Debra Riley (rileyd@manateeschools.net)

By When: Calendar- August 2023 Data Analysis- ongoing through May 2024

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).

NA

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, 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, 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; (5) Regular team meetings (ILT, TCT) to monitor progress toward school improvement.

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

Riley, Debra, rileyd@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 on-going review of student performance data. Teachers will use 'Decision Tree' instructional materials, including Benchmark Advance, Lexia CORE, guided reading, and 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 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
Facilitated, collaborative planning to increase teacher expertise of what students must know, understand and be able to do aligned to the rigor requirement of the benchmarks and to plan instructional task that engage all students. 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.	Watkins, Jodi, watkinsj2@manateeschools.net
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.	Riley, Debra, rileyd@manateeschools.net
Identify the instructional practices 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.	Deleo, Kimberly, deleok@manateeschools.net
Create a calendar of yearlong meeting structures to analyze student performance data, define key attributes of learners to address their unique needs, and evaluate available resources best matched to students' needs.	Riley, Debra, rileyd@manateeschools.net
Implement a response to intervention framework (MTSS) to support students' academic and behavioral success.	Morris, Amy, morris3a@manateeschools.net