

Manatee County Public Schools

Braden River 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	19
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	19
VI. Title I Requirements	21
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	22

Braden River Elementary School

6125 RIVER CLUB BLVD, Bradenton, FL 34202

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

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 at Braden River Elementary School is to engage our school community with innovative ways of learning to best prepare for an ever-changing world. By promoting leadership, collaboration and inquiry, we will foster and strengthen Life Skills and Problem Based Learning opportunities.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Sparking Innovative Leaders and Thinkers!

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
Bennett, Joshua	Principal	Responsible for all aspects of the SIP process, implementation, and evaluation.
Stancil, Tina	Assistant Principal	Supports the development, implementation, and evaluation of the SIP
Walker, Courtney	Instructional Coach	Assists with all aspects of the development, implementation, and evaluation of the SIP.

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.

Teachers and school staff are involved in the creation of the BRE SIP during the beginning of school year meetings in August. Following the initial development, we will present the plan to families and business leaders during the September SAC meeting for their input.

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 BRE SIP will be monitored using school and district assessment data points for progress toward goals. Additionally, teachers will utilize the strategies identified in the SIP during quarterly planning with administration and the instructional coach. Students who are in the lowest quartile will be monitored for progress on a semi-monthly basis in grade level teams supported by a member of the administrative leadership team.

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	38%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	42%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	7	11	11	17	4	0	0	0	0	50
One or more suspensions	60	6	47	9	8	5	0	0	0	135
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	26	13	9	0	0	0	48
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	16	13	8	0	0	0	37
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	10	16	10	34	25	0	0	0	0	95

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	3	2	2	3	8	0	0	0	0	18

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	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
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	7	11	6	0	0	0	24
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	8	4	0	0	0	12
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	15	24	28	11	6	0	0	0	84

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

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

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	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	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	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	7	11	6	0	0	0	24
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	8	4	0	0	0	12
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	15	24	28	11	6	0	0	0	84

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

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

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	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	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*	62	51	53	72	55	56	64		
ELA Learning Gains				65			54		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				55			20		
Math Achievement*	75	62	59	81	50	50	78		
Math Learning Gains				76			60		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				61			60		
Science Achievement*	72	51	54	64	65	59	55		
Social Studies Achievement*					66	64			
Middle School Acceleration					51	52			
Graduation Rate					52	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	63	59	59	90			83		

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

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

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	65
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	325
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	71

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	564
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	27	Yes	1	1
ELL	46			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	61			
HSP	56			
MUL	65			
PAC				
WHT	70			
FRL	56			

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	44			
ELL	70			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	62			
HSP	64			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
MUL	68			
PAC				
WHT	72			
FRL	58			

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	62			75			72					63
SWD	24			41			23				4	
ELL	33			56							4	63
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	57			64							2	
HSP	47			64			38				5	83
MUL	50			80							2	
PAC												
WHT	68			79			76				4	
FRL	53			66			57				5	55

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	55	81	76	61	64					90
SWD	30	50	47	49	50	38						
ELL	54	67		62	75							90
AMI												
ASN												

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
BLK	63	60		69	55							
HSP	64	60		73	75		50					
MUL	55			80								
PAC												
WHT	75	68	59	83	78	74	70					
FRL	64	59	47	73	67	53	42					

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	64	54	20	78	60	60	55					83
SWD	25	33		37	50		14					
ELL	55			65								83
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	55			50								
HSP	50	45		59	40		32					
MUL	35			53								
PAC												
WHT	70	52		87	64		67					
FRL	51	65		63	61	70	48					

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	76%	53%	23%	54%	22%
04	2023 - Spring	64%	54%	10%	58%	6%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	54%	47%	7%	50%	4%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	70%	62%	8%	59%	11%
04	2023 - Spring	73%	64%	9%	61%	12%
05	2023 - Spring	88%	61%	27%	55%	33%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	74%	49%	25%	51%	23%

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.

The lowest component of Braden River Elementary's data is in ELA, specifically third grade. Given this is the first year of FAST it is difficult to draw conclusions to prior year's third grade proficiency scores. However, in comparison with FSA, this is the largest drop in achievement. Prior year's iReady scores also showed this group of students in second grade to be lower performing than prior years of BRE data.

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

The greatest decline from year to year in the same grade level is third grade ELA. In 2021-2022, ELA third grade scores were 68% proficient. In 2022-2023, ELA third grade scores were 54% proficient. As stated previously, it is difficult to draw conclusions regarding a reason for a decline. It may be the group of students who were also lower performing in second grade.

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.

There are no gaps between Braden River Elementary's data and that of the state.

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

There are no content or grade levels that showed improvement moving from FSA in 2021-2022 to FAST in 2022-2023. However, there was no change in proficiency rates from 4th grade to 5th grade in ELA and a two percentage point loss from 4th grade to 5th grade in math.

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

The first area of concern were the number of out of school suspensions. These high numbers were the result of five students. Four of those students were provided a hardship to BRE. The hardship was revoked. The other area of concern is the number of students who are a level 1 in third grade. In drilling further into the data, these students predominantly are minority, socioeconomically disadvantaged, and/or have a disability.

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

1. Increase the percentage of proficient fourth graders in ELA based on their data as a cohort from 2022-2023.
2. Increase the percentage of proficient third graders in comparison to the 2022-2023 school data.
3. Increase the percentage of proficient third, fourth, and fifth grade students in mathematics.

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.

An area of focus will be increasing proficiency in ELA and math. It is a crucial need because the current cohort of fourth graders has the lowest percentage of proficiency in recent state testing data. We also want to focus on this group because they will be part of the lowest quartile. Additionally, the current third graders are crucial in this plan because the percentage of proficiency for third graders needs to dramatically increase from the 2022-2023 FAST data results.

Measurable Outcome:

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

If Tier I instruction is aligned to the rigor of the benchmarks, scaffolded to address individualized students' needs, and designed to increase accountability for learning among all students, then ELA and Math proficiency will increase by 10% or more as measured by 2024 Spring FAST. This expected growth is applied to all students at each grade level and for each ESSA subgroup to meet or exceed 41% proficient. The aim is to effectively scaffold students' mastery of benchmarks while closing achievement gaps for non-proficient students.

Monitoring:

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

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

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Joshua Bennett (bennettj@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 decision tree to follow resources at each tier.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

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

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

1. Facilitated, collaborative planning to increase teacher expertise of what students must know, understand, and be able to do aligned to the rigor required of the benchmarks and to plan instructional tasks that engage all students. Weekly collaborative planning will also address remedial and accelerated instruction for small groups and provide opportunities for problem-solving, discussion of high-effect practices, and ongoing review of student performance data.

Person Responsible: Joshua Bennett (bennettj@manateeschools.net)

By When: August 2023- May 2024

2. Define Look Fors related to high-quality instruction that are present every day, in every classroom, and for the benefit of every student. Create and use systems for monitoring Look Fors to strengthen alignment of daily instructional tasks to grade level benchmarks, ensure fidelity use of instructional resources for remedial and intervention instruction, and utilize strategies to engage all students.

Person Responsible: Joshua Bennett (bennettj@manateeschools.net)

By When: October 2023

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

Person Responsible: Courtney Walker (walker2c@manateeschools.net)

By When: Ongoing September 2023-April 2024

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

Person Responsible: Courtney Walker (walker2c@manateeschools.net)

By When: Ongoing August 2023-April 2024

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

Person Responsible: Joshua Bennett (bennettj@manateeschools.net)

By When: August 2023

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

Two out of five third grade teachers from the 2022-2023 school year have a take a year's leave for the 2023-2024 school year. This is not reflected in the other grade levels.

Measurable Outcome:

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

95% of the BRE instructional staff will return for the 2024-2025 school year.

Monitoring:

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

Teacher satisfaction will be monitored through teacher participation of social interactions with peers and with students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tina Stancil (stancilt@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.)

Gratification of higher order needs such as positive social relationships, rather than lower order needs (e.g., pay incentives). Therefore, providing opportunities throughout the school year for staff to engage with their colleagues in a fun environment will be incorporated in the work. A second intervention will be opportunities for teachers to engage positively with students in academic and non-academic settings.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

In a study, Measuring Teacher Job Satisfaction: Assessing Invariance in the Teacher Job Satisfaction Scale (TJSS) Across Six Countries, the article is focused on what contributes to teacher job satisfaction. According to Klassen and Chiu (2010) they confirmed the negative relationship between job satisfaction and occupational stress by demonstrating that, among primary teachers, high levels of occupational stress correspond to low levels of job satisfaction. Teacher job satisfaction is also linked to positive relationships with students.

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.

Sunshine Committee activities will be provided and encouraged.

Person Responsible: Tina Stancil (stancilt@manateeschools.net)

By When: August 2023-May 2024

Teacher involvement in extra-curricular activities to engage with students and families will be recorded.

Person Responsible: Tina Stancil (stancilt@manateeschools.net)

By When: September 2023-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).

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

N/A

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

N/A

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

N/A

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

N/A

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.

N/A

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

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?

N/A

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?

N/A

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
-------------	-----------------------------------

N/A

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))

List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

N/A

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.

List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

N/A

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

N/A

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

N/A

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students’ skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

N/A

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students’ access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

N/A

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

N/A

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

N/A

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

N/A

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