

Manatee County Public Schools

B.D. Gullett 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	28
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	28
VI. Title I Requirements	30
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	31

B.D. Gullett Elementary School

12125 44TH AVE E, Bradenton, FL 34211

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

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.

The mission of B. D. Gullett Elementary School is to inspire all learners to dream, achieve, and develop a love of learning through curiosity, commitment, and compassion.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Gullett Elementary is for each student to achieve full potential in his or her academic, creative, personal, physical, moral and spiritual development.

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
Richardson, Todd	Principal	
Gierhart, Julie	Assistant Principal	
Killian, Kathryn	Other	
McCaw, Lauren	Dean	
Connor, Andrea	Teacher, K-12	
Rueping, Melissa	Teacher, K-12	
McDaniel, Rebecca	Teacher, K-12	
Carter, Rachel	Teacher, K-12	
Bellew, Vanessa	Teacher, K-12	
Olsen, Kaitlynn	Teacher, K-12	
Gil, Katherine	Teacher, K-12	
Sippel, Kristin	Teacher, K-12	
Sharp, Melissa	Teacher, K-12	
Gyure, Adrienne	Teacher, K-12	
Sidnam, Janelle	Teacher, K-12	

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

The school SIP team completed individual sections and goal areas in response to data. Teachers, SAC members and other stakeholders will provide input throughout the development of the SIP plan. SIP goals and action steps will be formed and adjusted based on input from each stakeholder group.

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))

School, district and state assessments and progress monitoring will be analyzed with each grade level team throughout the year to ensure that progress is made in relationship to SIP goals. School leadership team will meet regularly to review and revise action steps to ensure progress is made toward identified goals. School leadership team will report to teachers, SAC and other stakeholders progress being made to meet SIP goals.

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	28%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	21%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) 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: 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	2	1	4	1	7	3	0	0	0	18
One or more suspensions	6	2	1	1	6	2	0	0	0	18
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	2	5	1	0	0	0	8
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	2	2	1	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	18	10	19	0	0	0	47
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	13	11	13	0	0	0	37
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	9	5	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	34

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

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

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	6	0	0	0	0	0	6
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	1	2	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	8
One or more suspensions	2	0	0	2	0	3	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	3	3	2	0	0	0	8
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	3	4	8	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	19	26	22	0	0	0	67
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	16	11	20	0	0	0	47
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	3	4	5	4	4	0	0	0	20

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

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

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	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	1	2	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	8
One or more suspensions	2	0	0	2	0	3	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	3	3	2	0	0	0	8
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	3	4	8	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	19	26	22	0	0	0	67
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	16	11	20	0	0	0	47
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	3	4	5	4	4	0	0	0	20

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

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

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	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*	74	51	53	75	55	56	74		
ELA Learning Gains				70			61		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				57			45		
Math Achievement*	81	62	59	84	50	50	79		
Math Learning Gains				74			68		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				62			58		
Science Achievement*	78	51	54	72	65	59	68		
Social Studies Achievement*					66	64			
Middle School Acceleration					51	52			
Graduation Rate					52	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	77	59	59	93			80		

** 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	77
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	387
Total Components for the Federal Index	5

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	73
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	587
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	49			
ELL	54			
AMI				
ASN	84			
BLK	54			
HSP	70			
MUL	72			
PAC				
WHT	79			
FRL	64			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	46			
ELL	70			
AMI				
ASN	86			
BLK	53			
HSP	69			
MUL	85			
PAC				
WHT	73			
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	74			81			78					77
SWD	47			52			50				4	
ELL	55			55			38				5	77
AMI												
ASN	81			89			82				3	
BLK	46			62							2	
HSP	68			74			75				5	67
MUL	65			77			73				3	
PAC												
WHT	76			83			78				4	
FRL	56			63			71				5	67

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	75	70	57	84	74	62	72					93
SWD	38	49	55	51	55	47	29					
ELL	77	71		75	64	50	60					93
AMI												
ASN	87	80		90	87							
BLK	33	47		57	53		73					
HSP	75	64	45	81	71	56	67					90
MUL	80	84		90	84		86					
PAC												
WHT	76	72	63	85	74	67	72					
FRL	57	62	53	64	64	54	57					

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	61	45	79	68	58	68					80
SWD	35	42	42	49	68	67	37					
ELL	71			74								80
AMI												
ASN	61			78								
BLK	41			47								
HSP	71	57	30	71	57		62					77
MUL	89			96								
PAC												
WHT	75	61	52	81	71	64	68					
FRL	53	52	30	59	61	47	49					

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	74%	53%	21%	54%	20%
04	2023 - Spring	78%	54%	24%	58%	20%
03	2023 - Spring	74%	47%	27%	50%	24%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	83%	62%	21%	59%	24%
04	2023 - Spring	77%	64%	13%	61%	16%
05	2023 - Spring	86%	61%	25%	55%	31%

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.

Our lowest performing areas are with our SWD and ELL Subgroups when it comes to proficiency. Historically, data indicates that our lowest quartile in ELA and Math are showing growth, but continue to need various levels of support through differentiated instruction. Because Gullett has a wide range of students in the lowest quartile, students scoring proficient and above, there is a need for accelerated instruction and various differentiation models.

Several contributing factors to the lower performance of these subgroups could be contributed to students new to Gullett. Throughout the year, we gain many new students who fall into the SWD and/or ELL subgroups. Another factor is large class sizes/teacher to student ratio, spreading thin the personnel hired to work directly with our SWD and ELL Subgroups.

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

This year, with the new FAST, the focus was on proficiency. Our proficiency has continued to stay steady, not seeing a major decline in any one particular area. We did notice that when comparing our 3rd, 4th and 5th grade Math proficiency to each grade level, our 4th graders performed below 3rd and

5th grade. This may be contributed to the introduction of Accelerated Math Groups and this particular grade level didn't have the typical/regular 4th grade standards taught, as they skipped right into a mix of 4th and 5th grade standards.

Florida recently changed their state assessment, focusing last year on solely proficiency. However, Gullett continued to provide supports to students needing to show growth. Recently, Manatee County implemented the B.E.S.T Benchmark/Standards and students transitioned to computer based testing. This year, students will be more familiar with the testing platform.

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.

When compared to other 3rd, 4th and 5th graders, our students out performed at the District and State levels in ELA.

3rd Grade ELA FAST

State: 297

District: 296

School: 310

4th Grade ELA FAST

State: 312

District: 311

School: 323

5th Grade ELA FAST

State: 320

District: 320

School: 334

When compared to other 3rd, 4th and 5th graders, our students out performed at the District and State levels in Math.

3rd Grade MATH FAST

State: 300

District: 301

School: 315

4th Grade MATH FAST

State: 315

District: 317

School: 327

5th Grade MATH FAST

State: 321

District: 326

School: 341

When compared to other 5th graders, our students out performed at the District and State levels in the area of Science.

5th Grade SCIENCE

State: 199

District: 198
School: 211

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

Data from previous state testing revealed that our greatest improvement was in the following area:

Math proficiency has increased by 16 points in the past two years.

Our school has created accelerated math classes, maintained instruction with Acaletics math club and provided additional supports for SWDs in a full day co-teach model in all grade levels.

Historically, our data component that showed the lowest performance was our Learning Gains categories. In this we have our lowest quartile learning gains, as well as our students scoring 4s and 5s who have to be considered in this category.

Contributing factors to growth during each Progress Monitoring Assessment were daily small group differentiation in ELA and math acaletics groups. Regularly scheduled data meetings to review student data at each grade level allowed for instruction groups to be fluid.

Current Acaletics curriculum facilitated in the growth of math proficiency.

Continued emphasis throughout the school to use more differentiated small groups during math instruction after a whole group introduction to the standard being taught.

Offering teachers professional development in small group math instruction. Teachers discussed and shared this vertically among teams.

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

Reflecting on the EWS data, potential areas of concern would be maintaining a high level of student proficiency across all grade levels as well as working with the bottom quartile of students, which includes various subgroups, including SWDs and ELLs.

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

Our highest priorities for school improvement in the 2023-2024 school year are:

- 1) Continuing to grow our students proficiency in ELA, Math and Science.
- 2) Increase our Level 4s and 5s.
- 3) Decrease our Level 1s in ELA.
- 4) SWD Learning Gains in ELA.
- 5) ELL Learning Gains 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. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

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.

Differentiation of Instruction for students is key to meeting the needs of the students at different times. Effective instructional practice is an important avenue to learning gains. By using current formative data collected by teachers, the needs of individual students and whole class can be measured to determine instructional pathways in all subject areas.

2022-2023 School data reflects 75% proficiency in ELA according to FAST Progress Monitoring 3 data. Teachers can use data to determine the next steps for whole group instruction as well as forming flexible small groups to preview new learning, reteaching information, accelerated instruction or provide an avenue for continued practice with current learning.

Our staff will rely on differentiation to ensure that students meet proficiency in ELA, as well as continue to focus on learning gains from our bottom quartile and SWD and ELL subgroups.

Gullett provides differentiation in ELA for students K-5, allowing students to be identified for additional ELA instruction through acceleration, on level or intensive supports.

Gullett offers a co-teach model classroom at various grade levels to provide more small group instruction throughout the day. This model is designed to meet the needs of students with various learning needs.

The differentiation provided through the co-teach model allows for more frequent instruction in small group.

Gullett provides mainstreaming opportunities to K-5 VE students and works to make sure students are exposed to core curriculum in the general education setting as appropriate.

ELL students receive support through ESOL certified teachers within their classroom, as well as our ESOL Paraprofessional supports that provide direct services and academic supports.

Differentiation of instruction will be crucial in the success of students proficiency and our school.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By May 2024, 78% or our students will be proficient in ELA, as evidenced by the Florida Assessment for Student Thinking.

Monitoring:

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

Grade level data meetings occur monthly with administration.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Julie Gierhart (gierhartj@manateeschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

We will use a variety of quantitative data tools to determine the instructional needs of the students. This formative data will be collected in a variety of ways. Our teachers will administer FAST 3x per year as a progress monitoring tool. Tri-annually, Jan Richardson Assessments will be administered. Teachers will flexibly group students to meet the different needs based on this data. Differentiation will occur through the grade levels during additional ELA instruction (FNC or WIN time). These differentiated groups will meet the needs of our students how are needing acceleration, on-level or intensive supports.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Knowing not all learners are the same is a fundamental factor to teaching and learning. Differentiation of instruction ensures that students will be receiving the right instruction at the right time. Using on-going data collection is instrumental in forming these hypotheses to better support learnings. Jan Richardson, Fountas and Pinnell, Marzano, Fisher, Frey, and Hattie's research supports our selection of this strategy.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

Continue to offer professional development opportunities for teachers to support differentiated instruction in ELA. The ELA PD will continue to focus on guided reading instruction through three steps: (1) Assessment, (2) Design, and (3) Implementation. On-going PD with our curriculum and standards will be provided to teachers throughout the year.

Person Responsible: Lauren McCaw (mccawl@manateeschools.net)

By When: On-going

Plan and conduct data meetings to analyze data for tiered interventions.

Person Responsible: Lauren McCaw (mccawl@manateeschools.net)

By When: On-going (monthly)

Offer coaching cycles and modeling for teachers to improve differentiated instruction efficacy based on teacher observation information.

Person Responsible: Julie Gierhart (gierhartj@manateeschools.net)

By When: On-going

Develop coaching cycles with teachers to improve differentiated instruction efficacy.

Person Responsible: Lauren McCaw (mccawl@manateeschools.net)

By When: On-going

Provide support for teachers on collective data into spreadsheets to use for planning purposes. Teachers will use School City as a data collection resource for FAST and Jan Richardson.

Person Responsible: Julie Gierhart (gierhartj@manateeschools.net)

By When: On-going

Provide weekly grade level support by joining grade level team meetings.

Person Responsible: Kathryn Killian (killiank@manateeschools.net)

By When: On-going

Collaboration and PD provided to Co-teachers, Inclusion teachers and ESE teachers.

Person Responsible: Julie Gierhart (gierhartj@manateeschools.net)

By When: On-going

Provide collaboration and support to our ESOL Paraprofessional and teachers.

Person Responsible: Kathryn Killian (killiank@manateeschools.net)

By When: On-going

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

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.

Providing effective re-teaching and activating prior knowledge to facilitate the delivery of future core instruction is an important avenue to students proficiency. Gullett's math data shows 83% proficiency according to 2022-2023 FAST Progress Monitoring Data.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By May 2024, 86% of our students will be proficient in Math, as evidenced by the Florida Assessment for Student Thinking (FAST).

Monitoring:

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

Our 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade teachers teach in differentiated math classes according to student levels. Students are placed in math classes based on students performance on a variety of previous assessments. General education math classes and accelerated math classes are offered for 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade students,

Our 3rd, 4th and 5th grade teachers are also instructing students in their Acaletics groups, based on instructional level. These Acaletic groups are fluid and change based on updated data throughout the year. These Acaletics groups allow teachers to pre-teach, reteach, and review math skills covered throughout the year.

Gullett offers a co-teach model at various grade levels to provide more small group instruction throughout the day. This model is designed to meet the needs of students with various learning needs. The differentiation provided throughout the co-teach model allows for more frequent instruction in small group. Gullett provides mainstreaming opportunities to K-5 VE students and works to make sure students are exposed to core curriculum in the general education classroom.

Our school coordinator works closely with the District ESOL department and our ESOL paraprofessional to meet the needs of our various ELL students.

Differentiation of instruction will be crucial in the success of student proficiency and our school.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Julie Gierhart (gierhartj@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.)

The math courses and Acaletics groups provide highly effective and engaging math problems that align with grade level benchmarks.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Knowing not all learners are the same is a fundamental factor to teaching and learning. Differentiation of instruction ensures that students will be receiving the right instruction at the right time. Using on-going data collection is instrumental in forming these hypotheses to better support learners. Jan Richardson, Fountas and Pinnell, Marzano, Fisher, Frey, and Hattie's research supports our selection of this strategy.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

Continue to offer professional development for teachers to support differentiated instruction in Math.

Person Responsible: Lauren McCaw (mccawl@manateeschools.net)

By When: On-going

Plan and conduct data meetings to analyze data for accelerated courses and general/on-level math courses.

Person Responsible: Lauren McCaw (mccawl@manateeschools.net)

By When: Beginning of the year.

Plan grade level opportunities for data driven instructional planning quarterly (Collaborative Planning).

Person Responsible: Lauren McCaw (mccawl@manateeschools.net)

By When: On-going

Develop coaching cycles with teachers to improve differentiated instruction efficacy.

Person Responsible: Lauren McCaw (mccawl@manateeschools.net)

By When: On-going

Develop coaching cycles with teachers to improve differentiated instruction efficacy based on teacher observation information.

Person Responsible: Julie Gierhart (gierhartj@manateeschools.net)

By When: On-going

Group ESE students into identified co-teach and inclusion classrooms and provide appropriate supports into these classrooms to ensure differentiation.

Person Responsible: Julie Gierhart (gierhartj@manateeschools.net)

By When: Beginning of the year

Provide weekly grade level support by joining grade level team meetings.

Person Responsible: Todd Richardson (richardt@manateeschools.net)

By When: On-going

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

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.

Providing effective re-teaching and activating prior knowledge to facilitate the delivery of future core instruction is an important avenue to learning gains. Gullett's 2022-2023 Science data reflects that 74% of students are proficient in this area.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By May 2024, 76% of our students will be proficient in Science as evidenced by the Florida Statewide Science Assessment.

Monitoring:

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

- Weekly team planning/meetings.
- Collaborative Planning.
- Grade level data meetings.
- District Science Benchmark Assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Todd Richardson (richardt@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.)

The WOZ science resources are specific to Next Generation Sunshine Standards, helping students learn more science topics than those included in the Next Generation Science Standards. They emphasize doing science, giving the learning the opportunity to pose questions and discover answers through project-based, hands-on experiences. The standard call for students to form hypotheses, test theories, and analyze data.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Utilizing the WOZ materials make it possible for students to experience what scientist do to investigate the natural world and what engineers do to design and build systems. These project-based lessons and materials promotes scientific inquiry, engaging students in practices that establish foundation knowledge of core scientific ideas and build on that foundation to ensure a cohesive understanding of science.

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.

Establish a Science Committee focusing on science curriculum and lateral planning.

Person Responsible: Rachel Carter (carterr04@manateeschools.net)

By When: Beginning of year.

Implementation and Professional Development opportunities for teachers focusing on the WOZ program.

Person Responsible: Rachel Carter (carterr04@manateeschools.net)

By When: On-going

Lateral planning during quarterly and grade level collaborative planning half days.

Person Responsible: Lauren McCaw (mccawl@manateeschools.net)

By When: On-going

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group 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.

Effective small group instruction is a key component to student success, particularly in the early elementary years. Students with disabilities benefit from daily small group instruction that is targeted to their specific deficits.

Meeting with small groups of students allows teachers to easily clear misunderstandings, gather accurate data, and improve the overall quality and accessibility of instruction – all while increasing student participation. Effective small group instruction targets singular skills while promoting discussion and exploration among students, both which are key components in content mastery.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By May 2024, our Students with Disabilities (SWD) and English Language Learners (ELL) subgroups will decrease the amount of level 1s by 5% as evidenced by the Florida Assessment for Student Thinking (FAST).

Monitoring:

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

Grade level data meetings occur monthly with administration.

Co-Teach, Inclusion and ESE teachers will meet monthly to review data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Julie Gierhart (gierhartj@manateeschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

We will use a variety of quantitative data tools to determine the instructional need of the students. This formative data will be collected in a variety of ways. Our teachers will administer FAST 3x per year as a progress monitoring tool. Jan Richardson Assessment will be administered. Teachers will flexibly group students to meet the various needs of students based on this data and their IEP or ELL plans. Small groups will run daily and align to the specific need/deficit of the student.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Knowing not all learners are the same is a fundamental factor to teaching and learning. Using small groups ensures that students are being provided direct instruction from their classroom teacher and instruction is targeted to meet their individual learning needs.

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.

Plan and conduct meetings to analyze data for small group instruction.

Person Responsible: Lauren McCaw (mccawl@manateeschools.net)

By When: On-going

Implement SIPPS for small group instruction (intervention), across all grade levels, for our lowest quartile.

Person Responsible: Lauren McCaw (mccawl@manateeschools.net)

By When: On-going

Plan grade level opportunities for data driven instructional planning quarterly (collaborative planning).

Person Responsible: Lauren McCaw (mccawl@manateeschools.net)

By When: On-going

Providing on-going collaboration and PD for teachers working directly with our SWDs and ELLs.

Person Responsible: Julie Gierhart (gierhartj@manateeschools.net)

By When: On-going

#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group 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.

Effective small group instruction is a key component to student success, particularly in the early elementary years. Students with disabilities benefit from daily small group instruction that is targeted to their specific deficits.

Meeting with small groups of students allows teachers to easily clear misunderstandings, gather accurate data, and improve the overall quality and accessibility of instruction – all while increasing student participation! Effective small group instruction targets singular skills while promoting discussion and exploration among students, both which are key components in content mastery.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By May 2024, our bottom quartile will increase their ELA level by 1, as evidenced by the Florida Assessment for Students Thinking (FAST).

Monitoring:

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

Grade level data meetings occur monthly with administration.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Todd Richardson (richardt@manateeschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

We will use a variety of quantitative data tools to determine the instructional need of the students. This formative data will be collected in a variety of ways. Our teachers will administer FAST 3x per year as a progress monitoring tool. Jan Richardson Assessment will be administered.

Small groups will run daily and align to the specific need/deficit of the student.

The bottom quartile will be identified and mentorships will be formed with various adults on campus.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Knowing not all learners are the same is a fundamental factor to teaching and learning. Using small groups ensures that students are being provided direct instruction from their classroom teacher and instruction is targeted to meet their individual learning needs.

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.

Plan and conduct meetings to analyze data for small group instruction.

Person Responsible: Lauren McCaw (mccawl@manateeschools.net)

By When: On-going

Plan grade level opportunities for data driven instructional planning quarterly (collaborative planning).

Person Responsible: Lauren McCaw (mccawl@manateeschools.net)

By When: On-going

Plan grade level opportunities for data driven instructional planning quarterly (collaborative planning).

Person Responsible: Lauren McCaw (mccawl@manateeschools.net)

By When: On-going

Create mentor groups for our bottom quartile students with various staff members around campus.

Person Responsible: Todd Richardson (richardt@manateeschools.net)

By When: On-going

#6. 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.

At Gullett Elementary, we believe that communication and collaboration is the key to building a supportive and appreciative environment in which to work and learn. Our goal is to involve all stakeholders in data driven decision making to benefit the school as a whole. Our staff was invited to assist in the writing of our School Improvement Plan. All staff is involved in the implementation of the plan. Professional Development for all of our staff is available through Schoology or in person. teachers write their PDP goals to align with our SIP goals.

Each year we hold elections for our SAC board and have always in the past had well attended SAC meetings. Traditionally, our SAC board has worked hard to hear the voices of the community. They bring perspective and viewpoints to our SAC meetings so that as a school community we are able to work together to solve issues and concerns. Our SAC will also be involved in the approval of the SIP for our school. Our PTO is also involved in ensuring the successful implementation of our SIP through raising funds to purchase necessary supplements to our curriculum and learning environment.

The same philosophy of teamwork holds true for our staff. We strive to provide timely communication to our staff of current trends using both qualitative and quantitative data. Our instructional leadership team collaborates with our administrative team to assist in decision making and communication. Our administrative team is readily available and transparent with all stakeholders. Our culture is one of collaboration and trust.

Overall the staff, students and families continue to provide a supportive environment focused on the health and safety of all. Our staff and families have truly bonded together to ensure a culture of appreciation and success at Gullett.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Gullett Elementary will retain 95% of their current 2023-2024 staff members for the 2024-2025 school year, as evidenced by next years allocation and teacher employment.

Monitoring:

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

Current administration will work closely with current and upcoming allocations and monitor staff members that may be leaving due to Leave of Absences, retirements, or transfers.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Todd Richardson (richardt@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.)

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

Open communication, support from school and district administration. Various opportunities for professional growth/development.

Safe and secure work and learning environment.

Gator Glows and other opportunities to recognize staff members.

Sunshine events to help build morale.

Person Responsible: Todd Richardson (richardt@manateeschools.net)

By When: On-going

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).

N/A

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: Differentiation	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	\$0.00
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Small Group Instruction	\$0.00
5	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Small Group Instruction	\$0.00
6	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.

Yes