

Manatee County Public Schools

Manatee High School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| SIP Authority and Purpose | 3 |
| I. School Information | 6 |
| II. Needs Assessment/Data Review | 8 |
| III. Planning for Improvement | 13 |
| IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review | 22 |
| V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence | 0 |
| VI. Title I Requirements | 0 |
| VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus | 0 |

Manatee High School

902 33RD STREET CT W, Bradenton, FL 34205

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

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 Manatee High School is to increase student engagement by providing opportunities to think in every classroom, every period, every day.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Manatee High School will be an exemplary student-centered environment that develops life long learners to be globally competitive.

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 |
|-----------------------|---------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Scarborough, Sharon | Principal | Leading the school on a daily basis. |
| Hall, Shane | Assistant Principal | Facilities, Operations, Science and ESE |
| Brigg, Denise | Assistant Principal | Safety, Security, Discipline, School Culture, English and Reading |
| Chmielewski, Joanne | School Counselor | |
| Zoller, Daria | Instructional Coach | |
| Murray, Stephen | Teacher, K-12 | Social Studies Department Chair |
| Catel, Heather | Teacher, K-12 | Fine Arts Department Chair |
| Kaminski-Beyer, Karen | Teacher, K-12 | Math Co-Department Chair |
| Cochran, Travis | Assistant Principal | Curriculum, scheduling, Graduation Rate and Acceleration |

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.

Each month the schools Instructional Leadership Team (ILT) meets monthly to discuss opportunities for individual and collective leadership, as well as monthly faculty meetings. Teachers, counselors, and administrators regularly communicate with families individually as well as through large scale methods such as ConnectEd calls, PeachJar flyers, and newsletters.

The schools School Advisory Council meets in the evenings once a month to ensure the SIP and Strategic plan are working to embed formal and informal leadership opportunities to build capacity of all the stakeholders. The schools SAC committee includes: administration, teachers, students, parents and business owners that help make decisions that are in the best interest of the school and community. School Advisory Committee (SAC) are actively engaged in supporting, brainstorming, trouble-shooting, and promoting a positive school culture and environment.

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 areas of focus will be implemented through a variety of activities such as professional development for faculty and staff; completion of school climate and family surveys; regular review of discipline referrals and Progress monitoring through FAST testing. Through regular communication, ILT, MTSS, Department, and Faculty meetings, SAC meetings, local business partner relationships, faculty and staff appreciation, and collaborating with families, all stakeholders have an opportunity to participate in the education and development of the Manatee High students.

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) | High School 9-12 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2022-23 Title I School Status | No |
| 2022-23 Minority Rate | 56% |
| 2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate | 65% |
| Charter School | No |
| RAISE School | No |
| ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024 | ATSI |
| Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) | No |
| 2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities (SWD)* 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: B 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: B |
| School Improvement Rating History | |
| DJJ Accountability Rating History | |

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* | 45 | 44 | 50 | 53 | 48 | 51 | 48 | | |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 52 | | | 48 | | |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 38 | | | 32 | | |
| Math Achievement* | 40 | 42 | 38 | 51 | 35 | 38 | 32 | | |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 45 | | | 28 | | |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 36 | | | 31 | | |
| Science Achievement* | 72 | 64 | 64 | 63 | 45 | 40 | 67 | | |
| Social Studies Achievement* | 65 | 59 | 66 | 63 | 43 | 48 | 61 | | |
| Middle School Acceleration | | | | | 37 | 44 | | | |
| Graduation Rate | 84 | 84 | 89 | 87 | 63 | 61 | 86 | | |
| College and Career Acceleration | 65 | 61 | 65 | 72 | 66 | 67 | 47 | | |
| ELP Progress | 41 | 41 | 45 | 44 | | | 45 | | |

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

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

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|------------------------------------------------|------|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI) | ATSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 59 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 2 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 412 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 7 |
| Percent Tested | 97 |
| Graduation Rate | 84 |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|------------------------------------------------|------|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI) | ATSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 55 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 3 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 604 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 11 |
| Percent Tested | 98 |
| Graduation Rate | 87 |

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

| 2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY | | | | |
|------------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|-------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------|
| ESSA Subgroup | Federal Percent of Points Index | Subgroup Below 41% | Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41% | Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32% |
| SWD | 30 | Yes | 4 | 1 |
| ELL | 35 | Yes | 2 | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | 80 | | | |
| BLK | 43 | | | |
| HSP | 53 | | | |
| MUL | 64 | | | |
| PAC | | | | |

| 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% |
| WHT | 72 | | | |
| FRL | 52 | | | |

| 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 | 36 | Yes | 3 | |
| ELL | 35 | Yes | 1 | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | 71 | | | |
| BLK | 38 | Yes | 1 | |
| HSP | 51 | | | |
| MUL | 70 | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 65 | | | |
| FRL | 49 | | | |

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 | 45 | | | 40 | | | 72 | 65 | | 84 | 65 | 41 |
| SWD | 21 | | | 20 | | | 29 | 36 | | 13 | 7 | 27 |
| ELL | 12 | | | 21 | | | 44 | 30 | | 33 | 7 | 41 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 80 | | | | | | | | | | 1 | |
| BLK | 21 | | | 12 | | | 56 | 46 | | 39 | 6 | |
| HSP | 38 | | | 34 | | | 66 | 56 | | 59 | 7 | 41 |

| 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 |
| MUL | 54 | | | 46 | | | 75 | 45 | | 71 | 6 | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 56 | | | 56 | | | 81 | 77 | | 74 | 6 | |
| FRL | 37 | | | 30 | | | 65 | 58 | | 52 | 7 | 42 |

| 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 | 53 | 52 | 38 | 51 | 45 | 36 | 63 | 63 | | 87 | 72 | 44 |
| SWD | 21 | 39 | 31 | 34 | 43 | 29 | 19 | 33 | | 78 | 33 | 36 |
| ELL | 19 | 36 | 37 | 29 | 32 | 32 | 24 | 17 | | 76 | 44 | 44 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 75 | 67 | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 32 | 43 | 23 | 23 | 30 | 36 | 28 | 37 | | 82 | 44 | |
| HSP | 44 | 47 | 37 | 44 | 42 | 36 | 49 | 54 | | 88 | 71 | 44 |
| MUL | 61 | 58 | | 63 | 64 | | 55 | 80 | | 82 | 93 | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 64 | 57 | 51 | 64 | 50 | 36 | 80 | 74 | | 87 | 82 | |
| FRL | 42 | 49 | 37 | 43 | 41 | 32 | 50 | 52 | | 83 | 65 | 43 |

| 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 | 48 | 48 | 32 | 32 | 28 | 31 | 67 | 61 | | 86 | 47 | 45 |
| SWD | 15 | 30 | 23 | 17 | 31 | 36 | 23 | 27 | | 77 | 22 | 45 |
| ELL | 18 | 38 | 31 | 18 | 24 | 24 | 44 | 16 | | 79 | 26 | 45 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 71 | 50 | | 30 | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 28 | 33 | 25 | 20 | 29 | 41 | 48 | 45 | | 79 | 14 | |
| HSP | 37 | 44 | 34 | 24 | 25 | 24 | 55 | 56 | | 82 | 48 | 46 |
| MUL | 65 | 52 | | 19 | 0 | | 65 | 50 | | 92 | 36 | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 60 | 55 | 34 | 45 | 32 | 40 | 80 | 71 | | 89 | 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 |
| FRL | 36 | 43 | 32 | 25 | 27 | 31 | 54 | 54 | | 81 | 36 | 52 |

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 |
| 10 | 2023 - Spring | 47% | 44% | 3% | 50% | -3% |
| 09 | 2023 - Spring | 41% | 46% | -5% | 48% | -7% |

| ALGEBRA | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 31% | 58% | -27% | 50% | -19% |

| GEOMETRY | | | | | | |
|----------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 50% | 56% | -6% | 48% | 2% |

| BIOLOGY | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 70% | 64% | 6% | 63% | 7% |

| HISTORY | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 64% | 58% | 6% | 63% | 1% |

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.

Math Achievement for English Language Learners (ELL) students showed the lowest performance. Math Achievement showed the lowest component overall. A contributing factor is the need to realign student placement as well as support our ELL students in all areas, not just in ELA and Reading.

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

Math Achievement for Student with Disabilities (SWD) declined by 13%. We have been working to incorporate more math remediation courses, but have not been able to include all students - this is an area for improvement.

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.

Once the data is uploaded a comparison can be made with the state data and the school data.

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

Science Achievement improved by 8% from 2022 to 2023. There were bi-monthly meetings for collaborative planning of Biology teachers as well as common assessments to monitor student progress and areas for improvement.

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

ELA Level One on State Assessments and Math Level One on State Assessments.

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

ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African American Students
 ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners
 ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities
 Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning Communities

Area of Focus

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

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American**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.

African American students' performance as measured by the federal index dropped below 41 percent for the second year in a row.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Raise Africa American math proficiency by 5 percentage points on the 23-24 School Year Algebra EOC.

Monitoring:

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

Content teams will conduct unit/chapter test item analysis and use FAST progress monitoring data and benchmark data to monitor subgroup performance. Regular classroom observations with feedback and coaching will help assist monitoring. MTSS and Early Warning Indicators will be reviewed regularly. Algebra 1 teachers will meet weekly to discuss best practices and collaboratively plan. An EOC boot camp will be offered for students that are below a level 3.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Math remediation, after school tutoring, boot camps, and research-based effective math programs, such as Khan Academy will support increased achievement for students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Students need to be on-level or above in math to complete required high school courses and graduate. Math proficiency directly impacts graduation rates. In particular, Black/African American and SWD students are historically marginalized in education and are often subjected to higher disciplinary actions. Individualized instruction, weekly checks, EWS meetings, and family communication will increase student success and support.

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.

Identify student subgroups who are underperforming. Weekly planning and support in English, Math and Science classes. Develop evidence-based routines and structures to be implemented in core classes.

Person Responsible: Travis Cochran (cochran@manateeschools.net)

By When: Ongoing through out the school year.

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners

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.

English Language Learner students' performance as measured by the federal index dropped below 41 percent.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Raise English Language Learner proficiency by 5 percentage points on the 23-24 School Year ELA Achievement.

Monitoring:

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

Content teams will conduct unit/chapter test item analysis and use FAST progress monitoring data and benchmark data to monitor subgroup performance. Regular classroom observations with feedback and coaching will help assist monitoring. MTSS and Early Warning Indicators will be reviewed regularly. ELA and Reading teams will meet regularly to discuss best practices and collaboratively plan.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Lexia Reading Program, No Red Ink, SAT test preparation, Regular Data Chats and goal-setting. Tier 3 support through intensive reading classes. The use of computer-assisted technology will help underclass students fill learning gaps in areas such as: phonics, phonetics, spelling, and reading comprehension that are tested on the FAST ELA assessment. Two inclusion classes for ninth and tenth graders that provide direct support from an ESOL teacher in the ELA class have been added as an intervention. ESOL Aide also pushes into Alg 1A classes for support. Direct instruction is powerful for ELL's because it gradually introduces/reintroduces content and continually assesses student progress to prevent them from falling further behind. Older students will benefit from exposure to SAT test preparation which help them earn concordant scores necessary to demonstrate proficiency.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Students need to be on-level or above in reading to complete required high school courses and graduate. Reading proficiency directly impacts graduation rates. Individualized instruction, weekly checks, EWS meetings, and family communication will increase student success and support.

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.

Identify student subgroups who are underperforming. Weekly planning and support in English and ESOL classes. Develop evidence-based routines and structures to be implemented in core classes.

Person Responsible: Denise Brigg (briggd@manateeschools.net)

By When: Ongoing through out the school year.

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

Students with Disabilities performance as measured by the federal index dropped below 41% for the third year in a row.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Raise Students with Disabilities by a minimum of five percentage points on the SY 23-24 FAST ELA Achievement.

Monitoring:

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

Content teams will conduct unit/chapter test item analysis and use FAST progress monitoring data and benchmark data to monitor subgroup performance. Regular classroom observations with feedback and coaching will help assist monitoring. MTSS and Early Warning Indicators will be reviewed regularly. ELA, Math, Science, History and Reading teams will meet regularly to discuss best practices and collaboratively plan.

Our ESE department in conjunction with administration, general education teachers, and support personnel will engage in Collaborative Data Chats to review the placement of all SWD students will ensure that students have been scheduled accordingly based on their educational goals through IST, MTSS and IEP meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Lexia, SAT test preparation via Khan Academy. Regular goal-setting and data chats. Small group 2/3 times a week and direct instruction. Students will receive Tier 3 support through Intensive Reading Classes.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

All strategies are district adopted and have ample peer-reviewed documentation to support their efficacy in raising student achievement. The use of computer-assisted technology will help underclass students fill learning gaps in areas such as phonics, phonetics, spelling, and reading comprehension that are tested in FAST Reading and Writing. Older students will benefit from SAT test preparation through Khan Academy which will help the students earn a concordant scores necessary to demonstrate Algebra 1, Reading and Writing proficiency. Direct instruction is powerful for SWD's because it gradually introduces/reintroduces content, reinforces that content, and continually assesses student progress so as to prevent them from falling further behind their peers.

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.

Weekly planning and support in English, Math, History and Science classes. Develop evidence-based routines and structures to be implemented in core classes.

Person Responsible: Shane Hall (halls@manateeschools.net)

By When: On going through out the school year.

#4. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

Through our data review, we noticed the students who struggle with daily attendance are also the students who are not meeting expectations for achievement and proficiency and more likely to fall into two early warning system categories.

Measurable Outcome:

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

When we successfully implement the We Are Mentors program, our students will receive mentoring, be held accountable for attendance and grades and that will contribute to improved student outcomes. The students that have two or more EWS will improve attendance by ten percent for the average daily attendance.

Monitoring:

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

Teachers will be paired with with students that are identified as an EWS student and the mentor will provide assistance, accountability, advocacy for support with assignments, regular attendance, relationships with parents and overall encouragement. Each mentor will track the check in and check out days. Mentors will track grades, discipline and attendance.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Shane Hall (halls@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.

Mentoring programs in schools have shown to be a cost-efficient way of increasing the positive relationships students have in their lives, while also having the potential to boost factors that can lead to educational success, such as connectedness to the school environment and peers, improved relationships with teachers and staff, improved feelings of academic competence, and greater access and use of other supports, such as tutoring, credit tracking, counseling, and postsecondary planning.

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.

Determine which students have two or more EWS indicators and assign the students to the teacher mentors.

Person Responsible: Shane Hall (halls@manateeschools.net)

By When: The mentors will be assigned students by the end of the first quarter.

#5. 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.

To retain all of our effective teachers each teacher is paired with a veteran peer mentor. The new teachers will meet with their mentors and instructional coach on a regular basis for support with BEST Standards, curriculum mapping, classroom management, and understanding and interpreting data.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We will retain 100% of our newly hired teachers that are effective.

Monitoring:

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

Facilitated, collaborative planning. Regular classroom observations with feedback and coaching. Regular use of assessment data to measure progress and coach for any adjustments with the lessons being delivered. Use Progress monitoring data to ensure student success.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Daria Zoller (zollerd@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.

Teacher mentoring programs tend to provide yearlong, one-to-one guidance to less experienced teachers, with mentors and mentees typically meeting at least once a week. Through those meetings with veteran teachers, plus impromptu classroom visits, lunchtime chats, texts, and phone calls, new teachers gain professional knowledge, skills to reflect on the status quo, and a vision for the future.

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.

Create a calendar of meetings for the new teacher group. Create a plan for coaching to ensure teacher and student success.

Person Responsible: Daria Zoller (zollerd@manateeschools.net)

By When: October 2023 and ongoing throughout the year.

Create a calendar of meetings for the new teacher group. Create a plan for coaching to ensure teacher and student success.

Person Responsible: Daria Zoller (zollerd@manateeschools.net)

By When: October 2023 and ongoing throughout the year.

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).

School Improvement funding is reviewed monthly by School Advisory Council (SAC), Instructional Leadership Team, Department teams and at monthly Faculty meeting to ensure input and accountability for funding is appropriate.

Boot Camps that are provided to our Subgroup categories have funding allocations that are reviewed regularly. The focus groups for new teachers also has allocation monies set aside for Professional Development, that SAC votes on.