

Manatee County Public Schools

Freedom 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	9
III. Planning for Improvement	14
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

Freedom Elementary School

9515 E STATE ROAD 64, Bradenton, FL 34212

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

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.

We, the family of Freedom Elementary, in order to form a more dynamic school, establish a community of innovative learners, empower all students to reach their individual potential, provide a safe and secure environment, promote cultural diversity in an ever-changing world, and inspire a spirit of life-long learning for our school community, establish this mission for Freedom Elementary School.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision at Freedom Elementary is to enhance our instructional delivery, with the purpose of increasing our students' academic achievement.

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
Grimes, Guy	Principal	Oversees all aspects of the school.
Danowski, Michele	Assistant Principal	Oversees all aspects of the school.
Brunner, Sherri	School Counselor	Facilitates IST procedures as well as counselor duties.
Cleveland, Kenzie	Dean	Testing Coordinator and oversees student behavior and interventions.

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 SIP development is thought through with the grade level teams and they offer suggestions for SIP. The SIP is composed and shared with our School Advisory Committee and Parent Teacher Organization. The leadership team reviews pertinent data and takes recommendations from all areas of the school stakeholders to finalize the SIP.

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 leadership team will monitor the SIP through monthly data review meetings looking at baseline data in conjunction with current data. At the conclusion of each meeting the leadership team will implement identified instructional shifts to ensure continuous improvement.

Demographic Data

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

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	39%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	44%
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) Asian Students (ASN) 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: 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	1	3	10	4	2	4	0	0	0	24	
One or more suspensions	0	1	5	3	3	1	0	0	0	13	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	5	8	5	0	0	0	18	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	3	4	1	0	0	0	8	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	13	11	13	0	0	0	37	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	12	8	13	0	0	0	33	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	1	3	10	4	2	1	0	0	0	21

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

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	10	15	11	19	9	0	0	0	64	
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	4	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	7	4	0	0	0	0	11	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	7	4	1	0	0	0	12	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	9	10	5	0	0	0	24	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	8	7	10	0	0	0	25	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	3	5	3	3	0	0	0	15

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	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	5
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	0	10	15	11	19	9	0	0	0	64	
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	4	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	7	4	0	0	0	0	11	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	7	4	1	0	0	0	12	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	9	10	5	0	0	0	24	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	8	7	10	0	0	0	25	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	3	5	3	3	0	0	0	15

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	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	5
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*	75	51	53	72	55	56	66		
ELA Learning Gains				65			51		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				64			10		
Math Achievement*	77	62	59	84	50	50	79		
Math Learning Gains				74			70		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				55			41		
Science Achievement*	67	51	54	73	65	59	62		
Social Studies Achievement*					66	64			
Middle School Acceleration					51	52			
Graduation Rate					52	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	80	59	59	58			76		

* 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	75
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	377
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	68

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	545
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	30	Yes	1	1
ELL	58			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	54			
MUL	67			
PAC				
WHT	83			
FRL	59			

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	56			
ELL	63			
AMI				
ASN	66			
BLK	57			
HSP	68			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
MUL	64			
PAC				
WHT	71			
FRL	59			

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	75			77			67					80
SWD	36			33			9				4	
ELL	44			50							3	80
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	44			56			53				5	82
MUL	72			61							2	
PAC												
WHT	85			86			71				4	
FRL	62			62			50				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	72	65	64	84	74	55	73					58
SWD	50	47		62	63							
ELL	52	55		78	73							58
AMI												
ASN	57	55		79	73							

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
BLK	57			57								
HSP	63	61	80	79	71		65					55
MUL	57			71								
PAC												
WHT	78	66	52	89	76	52	83					
FRL	57	58	57	71	67	54	51					55

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	66	51	10	79	70	41	62					76
SWD	38	10		51	50		17					
ELL	55			68								76
AMI												
ASN	82			88								
BLK	39			61								
HSP	53	43		71	71		44					75
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	72	54		83	70	38	66					
FRL	55	42		72	69		55					71

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	71%	53%	18%	54%	17%
04	2023 - Spring	77%	54%	23%	58%	19%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	72%	47%	25%	50%	22%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	74%	62%	12%	59%	15%
04	2023 - Spring	87%	64%	23%	61%	26%
05	2023 - Spring	73%	61%	12%	55%	18%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	67%	49%	18%	51%	16%

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.

Freedom's lowest performance data point was our lowest quartile in mathematics. The data points collected throughout the school year showed a trend in our third and fifth grade classes attributed to the change in the state standards and curriculum maps.

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

Freedom's greatest decline from the previous year was third grade mathematics showing a decline of 9% points. The data points collected throughout the school year showed a trend in our third-grade classes attributed to the change in the state standards and curriculum maps. There was also evidence of gaps between second grade curriculum moving to the third-grade BEST standards curriculum.

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.

Freedom's data was higher than the state averages in all areas.

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

Freedom's fourth grade data showed the most improvement by an increase of 8%. We did not introduce any new strategies but rather kept to fidelity with the curriculum and use of Acaletics.

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

Our first identified area of focus from our EWS data is the number of students scoring Level 1 on the FAST assessment.

Our second identified area of focus from our EWS data is the number of retained students in third grade. Approximately half of our seven retained students did not attend Freedom last year. Most of these students scored a Level 1 in both ELA and mathematics.

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

1. Increase proficiency with our lowest quartile students.
2. Increase proficiency with our Economically Disadvantaged students.
3. Increase proficiency with our Black/African American students.
4. Increase proficiency with our third-grade students in ELA.

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 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.

When reviewing discipline data, it was noted that the majority of incidents occurred within the classroom. In order to protect and enhance instructional time, behavioral distractions and referrals need to decrease.

Measurable Outcome:

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

If Tier 1 behavior management is aligned to CHAMPS and SOAR to address individual students' needs and designed to increase accountability for learning for all students, then our referral rate will decrease 10% or more by the end of the 2023-2024 school year.

Monitoring:

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

Systems for monitoring high quality classroom management include regular classroom observations with feedback and coaching, use of environmental reminders (poster/charts), multi-tiered system of support, and regular meetings with all stakeholders.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Guy Grimes (grimesg@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 level of support.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

An effective behavior management framework has the following components: strong high quality behavior management plan for all students, use of data to measure and monitor behavioral progress, identification of at-risk students, targeted evidence-based interventions, and routine collaboration with all stakeholders.

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.

Define Look Fors related to high quality classroom management that are present every day in every classroom and benefit every student. Ensure fidelity of CHAMPS resources.

Person Responsible: Michele Danowski (danowskm@manateeschools.net)

By When: By November of 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.

Based on our most current data, our third-grade students decreased their proficiency by 9%, our fourth-grade students increased their proficiency by only 2% and our fifth-grade students decreased their proficiency by 6%.

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 the 2024 Spring FAST. The expected growth is applied to all students at each grade level and for each ESSA subgroup to meet or exceed 50% 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 facilitated, collaborative planning, regular classroom observations with feedback and coaching, routine use of student performance data to make instructional decisions, multi-tiered system of support and regular team meetings, such as ILT, PLCs, and TCTs, to monitor progress toward school improvement.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Guy Grimes (grimesg@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: strong, high-quality classroom instruction for all students, use of assessment data to measure and monitor academic/behavioral progress, identification of at-risk students, targeted, evidenced based interventions, and 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 task that

engage all students. Regularly 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.

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 interventions instruction, and utilize strategies to engage all students.

Identify the instructional practices that will increase teacher capacity and create a plan for coaching to accelerate improvement.

Person Responsible: Michele Danowski (danowskm@manateeschools.net)

By When: By November of 2023.