

Manatee County Public Schools

Annie Lucy Williams Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| SIP Authority and Purpose | 3 |
| I. School Information | 6 |
| II. Needs Assessment/Data Review | 10 |
| III. Planning for Improvement | 14 |
| IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review | 23 |
| V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence | 23 |
| VI. Title I Requirements | 0 |
| VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus | 25 |

Annie Lucy Williams Elementary School

3404 FORT HAMER RD, Parrish, FL 34219

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

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.

Our mission is to inspire students, families and staff to have a passion for life long learning through building a strong community where students feel loved, respected and encouraged to develop to their full potential.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Williams Elementary is to create an environment to develop independent life long learners who will excel as productive global citizens.

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 |
|--------------------|------------------------|--|
| Keezer, Andrea | Principal | Lead and support a group of educators to have the greatest possible impact on student learning in all areas. |
| Blanchard, Rachel | Administrative Support | Lead and support a group of educators to have the greatest possible impact on student learning in all areas. |
| Brumby, Jessica | Dean | Support the vision of the leadership team by expanding systems to prioritize student learning, increasing positive student behaviors, and developing sustainable teacher capacity. |
| Carriker, Jennifer | Dean | Support the vision of the leadership team by working to increase positive student behaviors, coaching staff in the area of behavior management strategies and best practices for our ESE student population. |
| Byrd, Cinda | Other | Support the vision of the leadership team by serving teachers in the capacity of a curriculum leader, instructional coach, and content expert. |

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 Williams leadership team worked with all internal and external stakeholders to develop the School Improvement Plan for 2023-2024. During our 'Welcome Back' staff meeting, we shared school-wide data from the previous school year to analyze our strengths and weaknesses as a staff. All parents, families, businesses, and community leaders were made aware of our School Advisory Council meetings where this data was also discussed and analyzed.

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 School Improvement Plan will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the Florida academic standards on a monthly basis. The ILT team will discuss and analyze the most current data elements including PM1, PM2, PM3, Acaletics Scrimmages, Common Formative Assessments, and behavior data.

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 | 30% |
| 2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate | 33% |
| Charter School | No |
| RAISE School | No |
| ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024 | ATSI |
| Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) | No |
| 2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities (SWD)* 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: 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 | 20 | 9 | 8 | 15 | 11 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 92 |
| One or more suspensions | 2 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 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 | 0 | 7 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 11 | 15 | 10 | 7 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 60 |
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

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

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

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 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 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 | 20 | 9 | 24 | 11 | 18 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 95 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Course failure in 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 | 11 | 14 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 12 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 5 | 14 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 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 | 20 | 15 | 38 | 15 | 34 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 147 |

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 | 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 | 20 | 9 | 24 | 11 | 18 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 95 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Course failure in 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 | 11 | 14 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 12 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 5 | 14 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 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 | 20 | 15 | 38 | 15 | 34 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 147 |

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 | 0 |
| 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* | 64 | 51 | 53 | 74 | 55 | 56 | 74 | | |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 70 | | | 63 | | |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 46 | | | 36 | | |
| Math Achievement* | 72 | 62 | 59 | 80 | 50 | 50 | 82 | | |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 77 | | | 73 | | |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 63 | | | 55 | | |
| Science Achievement* | 63 | 51 | 54 | 75 | 65 | 59 | 69 | | |
| Social Studies Achievement* | | | | | 66 | 64 | | | |
| Middle School Acceleration | | | | | 51 | 52 | | | |
| Graduation Rate | | | | | 52 | 50 | | | |
| College and Career Acceleration | | | | | | 80 | | | |
| ELP Progress | | 59 | 59 | | | | | | |

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

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

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|--|------|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI) | ATSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 67 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 2 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 266 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 4 |
| Percent Tested | 99 |
| Graduation Rate | |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|--|------|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI) | ATSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 69 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 1 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 485 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 7 |
| Percent Tested | 100 |
| 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 | 27 | Yes | 4 | 1 |
| ELL | 50 | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | 37 | Yes | 1 | |
| HSP | 63 | | | |
| MUL | 68 | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 70 | | | |

| 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% |
| FRL | 53 | | | |

| 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 | 40 | Yes | 3 | |
| ELL | | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | 64 | | | |
| HSP | 68 | | | |
| MUL | 86 | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 70 | | | |
| FRL | 63 | | | |

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 | 64 | | | 72 | | | 63 | | | | | |
| SWD | 20 | | | 30 | | | 18 | | | | 4 | |
| ELL | 55 | | | 45 | | | | | | | 2 | |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 33 | | | 52 | | | 27 | | | | 3 | |
| HSP | 62 | | | 58 | | | 73 | | | | 4 | |
| MUL | 59 | | | 76 | | | | | | | 2 | |

| 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 |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 67 | | | 76 | | | 66 | | | | 4 | |
| FRL | 47 | | | 59 | | | 46 | | | | 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 | 74 | 70 | 46 | 80 | 77 | 63 | 75 | | | | | |
| SWD | 32 | 39 | 23 | 46 | 61 | 40 | 38 | | | | | |
| ELL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 53 | 67 | | 68 | 69 | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 61 | 70 | | 68 | 83 | | 58 | | | | | |
| MUL | 88 | 83 | | 88 | 83 | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 76 | 69 | 49 | 82 | 76 | 62 | 75 | | | | | |
| FRL | 62 | 67 | 47 | 71 | 74 | 60 | 63 | | | | | |

| 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 | 74 | 63 | 36 | 82 | 73 | 55 | 69 | | | | | |
| SWD | 40 | 26 | 27 | 52 | 39 | 40 | 15 | | | | | |
| ELL | 60 | | | 70 | | | | | | | | |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 55 | | | 57 | | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 68 | 54 | | 76 | 77 | | 77 | | | | | |
| MUL | 65 | | | 82 | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 77 | 66 | 29 | 84 | 76 | 55 | 74 | | | | | |
| FRL | 59 | 57 | 38 | 69 | 63 | 60 | 53 | | | | | |

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 | 73% | 53% | 20% | 54% | 19% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 60% | 54% | 6% | 58% | 2% |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 65% | 47% | 18% | 50% | 15% |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 79% | 62% | 17% | 59% | 20% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 61% | 64% | -3% | 61% | 0% |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 75% | 61% | 14% | 55% | 20% |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 62% | 49% | 13% | 51% | 11% |

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.

Our area of lowest performance was the Students with Disabilities subgroup. We are performing below the state threshold at 31%. More specifically lower performing is our ELA achievement in the SWD subgroup. For the 2022-2023 school year, this subgroup was only 28% proficient in ELA.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline in performance from 2021-2022 was our overall science proficiency. We believe this is correlated to our overall ELA achievement also seeing a decline.

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.

Since State data for 2022-2023 is not available for reference, we compared our data to the District average. All areas were above the district average apart from fourth grade math. The district was at 64% and Williams was at 61%. This discrepancy was due to multiple factors to include inability to hire new allocation until December and urgency in delivery of instruction in 2022-2023. In order to rectify this situation, the team is collaboratively planning for the individual needs of students.

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

Although our Students with Disabilities subgroup is our greatest area of concern, it was also the area that showed the greatest growth from 2021-2022 to 2022-2023. We went from 16% overall ELA achievement for SWD to 28% overall ELA achievement.

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

According to our EWS data, 60 students are identified as having a substantial reading deficiency, and 92 students have been absent for more than 10% of school days.

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

Our students with disabilities subgroup ELA proficiency is our top priority. The discrepancy between our overall ELA achievement and SWD subgroup achievement is unacceptable. Another top priority of ours is closing the achievement gap with L25 students reaching proficiency.

Area of Focus

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

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

Upon analyzing data of ELA Statewide Assessment proficiency for students with disabilities, there is a noticeable historical trend of Williams' students performing below the school proficiency rate. This subgroup was at 28% proficient in ELA for the 2022-2023 school year, while the whole population was 66%.

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 2023-2024 school year, at least 32% of Williams' students with disabilities will be demonstrating proficiency on the ELA Statewide Assessment.

Monitoring:

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

Data will be continually monitored through state progress monitoring assessments, common formative assessments, and DRA reading levels. ESE resource teachers and homeroom teachers will continue to progress monitor with biweekly DIBELS assessments. The leadership team will conduct weekly walkthroughs of all classrooms to ensure that our ESE student population is being supported in the highest regard. PLCs will occur on a monthly basis with MTSS coordinator to review student data and drive instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Andrea Keezer (keezera@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.)

Benchmark Advance Tier 2 and Tier 3 for Grade 2-5: This resource was a Moderate ESSA Evidence Level based on an Indian River Study. Source of the Study: Benchmark Education Company. (2020, January 30). ESSA Evidence for Benchmark Advance and Benchmark Adelante: Updated for the 2017–2018 to 2018–2019 School Years.

Literacy Footprints for Grades K-1: McREL Study Finds Literacy Footprints Meets Criteria for Tier 1 (Strong Evidence) under ESSA.

Lexia for Grades K-5: This resource has nine peer-reviewed research studies that meet the two highest standards of evidence under ESSA—Strong and Moderate.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

In order to improve our SWD ELA data, we will need to focus on identified students with disabilities, and provide them a reduced ratio in the classroom while utilizing targeted, direct instructional practices to increase their reading abilities.

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.

Instructional Walkthroughs- Andrea Keezer, Rachael Blanchard, Jessica Brumby, Jennifer Carriker and Cinda Byrd.

Data Monitoring- Andrea Keezer, Rachael Blanchard, Jessica Brumby

PLC Meetings- Rachael Blanchard, Jessica Brumby

Person Responsible: Andrea Keezer (keezera@manateeschools.net)

By When: Ongoing.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

Data from the 2021-2022 ELA Statewide Assessment indicates that Williams' students in the bottom quartile perform significantly below the school proficiency rate. Since we have no L25 data from 2022-2023, we are referencing this data from 2021-2022. This group was at 46% proficient in ELA for the 2021-2022 school year, while the whole population was 66% for 2022-2023.

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 2023-2024 school year, at least 56% of Williams' bottom quartile students will be demonstrating proficiency on the ELA Statewide assessment.

Monitoring:

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

Data will be continually monitored through state progress monitoring assessments, common formative assessments, and DRA reading levels. Homeroom teacher will continue to progress monitor students who are Tier 2 and Tier 3 with biweekly DIBELS assessments. The leadership team will conduct weekly walkthroughs of all classrooms to ensure that the bottom quartile student population is being supported through small group instruction.

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.)

Benchmark Advance Tier 2 and Tier 3 for Grade 2-5: This resource was a Moderate ESSA Evidence Level based on an Indian River Study. Source of the Study: Benchmark Education Company. (2020, January 30). ESSA Evidence for Benchmark Advance and Benchmark Adelante: Updated for the 2017–2018 to 2018–2019 School Years.

Literacy Footprints for Grades K-1: McREL Study Finds Literacy Footprints Meets Criteria for Tier 1 (Strong Evidence) under ESSA.

Lexia for Grades K-5: This resource has nine peer-reviewed research studies that meet the two highest standards of evidence under ESSA—Strong and Moderate.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

In order to improve our bottom quartile ELA data, we will need to utilize targeted, direct instructional practices to increase their reading abilities.

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.

Instructional Walkthroughs- Andrea Keezer, Rachael Blanchard, Jessica Brumby, Jennifer Carriker Cinda Byrd

Data Monitoring- Andrea Keezer, Rachael Blanchard, Jessica Brumby

PLC Meetings- Rachael Blanchard, Jessica Brumby, Classroom Teachers

Person Responsible: Andrea Keezer (keezera@manateeschools.net)

By When: Ongoing.

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

According to the state of Florida, reading proficiency is considered to be a key indicator for student success. At Williams Elementary School, we are striving to have every child read on grade level. Our data from 2022-2023 indicated that only 66% of our student population is reading on grade level.

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 2023-2024 school year, at least 75% of Williams' students will be demonstrating proficiency on the ELA Statewide assessment.

Monitoring:

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

Data will be continually monitored through state progress monitoring assessments, common formative assessments, and DRA reading levels. Homeroom teacher will continue to progress monitor students who are Tier 2 and Tier 3 with biweekly DIBELS assessments. The leadership team will conduct weekly walkthroughs of all classrooms to ensure that all students are being supported through engaging and rigorous ELA instruction.

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.)

Benchmark Advance Tier 2 and Tier 3 for Grade 2-5: This resource was a Moderate ESSA Evidence Level based on an Indian River Study. Source of the Study: Benchmark Education Company. (2020, January 30). ESSA Evidence for Benchmark Advance and Benchmark Adelante: Updated for the 2017–2018 to 2018–2019 School Years.

Literacy Footprints for Grades K-1: McREL Study Finds Literacy Footprints Meets Criteria for Tier 1 (Strong Evidence) under ESSA.

Lexia for Grades K-5: This resource has nine peer-reviewed research studies that meet the two highest standards of evidence under ESSA—Strong and Moderate.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

In order to improve our overall ELA achievement data, we will need to utilize targeted, direct instructional practices to increase the reading abilities of all students. Every student, regardless of reading ability, will participate in small group instruction during CORE and either acceleration or remediation during Extended Hour.

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.

Instructional Walkthroughs- Andrea Keezer, Rachael Blanchard, Jessica Brumby, Jennifer Carriker Cinda Byrd

Data Monitoring- Andrea Keezer, Rachael Blanchard, Jessica Brumby

PLC Meetings- Rachael Blanchard, Jessica Brumby, Classroom Teachers

Person Responsible: Andrea Keezer (keezera@manateeschools.net)

By When: Ongoing.

#4. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

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.

Our 2022-2023 FOCUS data shows that 219 disciplinary referrals were written. Of these referrals, 170 were written for students who are in the Students with Disabilities subgroup, and many of the 170 referrals were from 28 students in particular.

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 2023-2024 school year, we will reduce overall student referrals written by 5% as measured by student incidents in FOCUS.

Monitoring:

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

Monthly ILT meetings will analyze this data and will identify students who appear more frequently with referrals. An action plan will be created to assist particular students in need.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jessica Brumby (brumbyj@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.)

Utilizing high yield practices such as PBIS, CHAMPS, restorative practices, daily check-ins and climate survey of students, has been proven to be effective strategies to address student behavior. Research shows that behavior improves when life skills strategies are practiced and implemented into curriculum consistently. Students have shown a positive trend in behavior when provided with multiple strategies to utilize in class or independently. Students have also shown a positive behavior trend when CHAMPS expectations are clearly laid out and explained thoroughly.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

These strategies are selected based on student data and need, indicating that students consistently struggle with appropriate decision-making and emotional well-being. Students who are fully understanding the expectations throughout the school day and are engaged in a positive and interactive learning environment are more likely to make appropriate decisions and

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.

Develop CHAMPS classroom management plans and monitor for effectiveness: Classroom teachers, Jennifer Carriker, Jessica Brumby
 Monitor monthly behavior data and analyze trends: ILT Team

Implement Life Skills Lessons: Guidance Counselors

Celebrate Positive Student Behavior: All Staff

Person Responsible: Andrea Keezer (keezera@manateeschools.net)

By When: 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).

Any allocation of resources would be used to directly improve our students needs based on the data. SWD and our bottom quartile would be served.

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

In first grade, we missed our goal by 1 percentage point. We will focus on direct instruction through differentiation to ensure each student's needs are met. We will explicitly teach phonics and practice reading with fluency.

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

NA

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

By the end of the 2023-2024 school year, our first grade students' reading proficiency will exceed 51% as measured by our State assessment for PM 3.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

NA

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.

We will progress monitor each students growth during our monthly MTSS-A meetings. We will discuss specific student data and will provide additional interventions were deemed necessary.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Keezer, Andrea, keezera@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?

Literacy Footprints for Grades 1: McREL Study Finds Literacy Footprints Meets Criteria for Tier 1 (Strong Evidence) under ESSA.

Lexia for Grade K: This resource has nine peer-reviewed research studies that meet the two highest standards of evidence under ESSA—Strong and Moderate.

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?

Literacy footprints is a dynamic program that directly impacts meeting students' individual needs through leveled texts.

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 |
|---|---|
| Literacy Coaching-our Student Support Specialist will be coaching and pushing into classrooms to support our teachers and students in the area of Literacy. | Keezer, Andrea, keezera@manateeschools.net |
| Assessment-We will be using ongoing common formative assessments, meeting to discuss data, determining the needs of each student and differentiating to meet those specified needs. | |

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

| | | | |
|---------------|--------|--|---------------|
| 1 | III.B. | Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities | \$0.00 |
| 2 | III.B. | Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA | \$0.00 |
| 3 | III.B. | Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA | \$0.00 |
| 4 | III.B. | Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other | \$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