

Manatee County Public Schools

Ballard Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	22
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	22
VI. Title I Requirements	24
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	27

Ballard Elementary School

912 18TH ST W, Bradenton, FL 34205

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Department encourages schools to use the SIP as a “living document” by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

We believe that all students are important and valuable.

We believe that challenge does not break us but is the foundation for our success.

We believe that our dreams and goals will be reached through hard work and effort.

We believe that effort is the key to our success.

We believe that all students will be successful everyday who work hard and try.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Ballard will be a collaborative learning community of students, families, and staff aspiring to create leaders and positive role models who will serve as anchors for the future. We will empower all students to achieve their highest level of academic excellence, and we will work cooperatively to establish a respectful and supportive learning environment.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Keezer, Rudy	Principal	Lead the Senior Leadership Team, delegate, and monitor all aspects of the school with a priority in student achievement, student behavior, and school safety. Develop capacity and future school leaders.
Oliva, Mary	Assistant Principal	Lead MTSS and ILT teams, lead and monitor state assessments, implement core instruction, monitor and plan Title 1 initiatives.
Adriano, Victoria	Dean	Assessment coordinator, life skills coordinator, attendance monitor, MTSS facilitator and IST chair, monitor implementation of interventions (academic and behavior).
Miller, Nancy	Instructional Coach	Create and analyze assessments that drive instruction, expert in curriculum, model, coach, and support implementation of instruction and cooperative learning

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 process began by adding data from state testing and staff data from summer planning. The school leadership team took input from staff including end of year surveys to create a draft. The process then moved to asking for staff input during our full staff faculty meeting on 8/9/23. On 8/14/23 the Instructional Leadership team gave input. Revisions were made and reviewed by grade level team leaders on 8/29/23. The plan was then presented for input to all School Advisory Council including student members on 9/7/23.

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))

SIP will be reviewed at every faculty, team leader, ILT, TCT, SAC and district instructional meetings.

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	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	79%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
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) 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: C 2019-20: C

	2018-19: C 2017-18: D
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	5	13	13	16	12	15	0	0	0	74	
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	2	5	3	0	0	0	11	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	8	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	9	14	23	13	13	0	0	0	72	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	19	13	22	28	14	0	0	0	96	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	2	2	6	14	14	0	0	0	39	

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	1	13	13	22	14	14	0	0	0	77

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	8	0	0	0	0	0	8
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	2	16	19	22	19	21	0	0	0	99	
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	3	9	0	0	0	13	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	9	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	12	27	36	0	0	0	75	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	12	22	0	0	0	34	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	5	14	27	36	0	0	0	82	

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	5	14	27	36	0	0	0	82

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	12	0	0	0	0	0	12
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	2	16	19	22	19	21	0	0	0	99	
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	3	9	0	0	0	13	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	9	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	12	27	36	0	0	0	75	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	12	22	0	0	0	34	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	5	14	27	36	0	0	0	82	

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	5	14	27	36	0	0	0	82

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	12	0	0	0	0	0	12
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review**ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)**

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	32	51	53	37	55	56	34		
ELA Learning Gains				47			41		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				59			47		
Math Achievement*	43	62	59	45	50	50	49		
Math Learning Gains				56			56		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				53			41		
Science Achievement*	22	51	54	45	65	59	36		
Social Studies Achievement*					66	64			
Middle School Acceleration					51	52			
Graduation Rate					52	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	56	59	59	63			50		

* 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	37
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	187
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	405
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	97
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	6	Yes	4	2
ELL	32	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	26	Yes	1	1
HSP	36	Yes	1	
MUL	50			
PAC				
WHT	40	Yes	1	

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
FRL	37	Yes	1	

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	30	Yes	3	1
ELL	48			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	42			
HSP	47			
MUL	45			
PAC				
WHT	60			
FRL	51			

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	32			43			22					56
SWD	3			20			0				4	
ELL	21			41			18				5	56
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	24			25			29				4	
HSP	29			42			13				5	58
MUL	40			60							2	

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
PAC												
WHT	44			53			38				4	
FRL	33			40			23				5	55

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	37	47	59	45	56	53	45					63
SWD	9	23	31	17	47	50	30					
ELL	29	50	67	35	51	50	37					63
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	31	48		34	54							
HSP	31	45	60	40	48	50	36					62
MUL	50			40								
PAC												
WHT	52	45		66	78		58					
FRL	38	49	58	44	55	52	43					67

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	34	41	47	49	56	41	36					50
SWD	14	29		26	35	27	38					57
ELL	26	38	40	54	54		30					50
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	28	42		37	50		16					
HSP	30	40	42	54	63		45					51
MUL	36			45								
PAC												
WHT	54	42		54	42		42					
FRL	30	39	45	46	58	40	41					41

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	23%	53%	-30%	54%	-31%
04	2023 - Spring	46%	54%	-8%	58%	-12%
03	2023 - Spring	30%	47%	-17%	50%	-20%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	44%	62%	-18%	59%	-15%
04	2023 - Spring	58%	64%	-6%	61%	-3%
05	2023 - Spring	30%	61%	-31%	55%	-25%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	20%	49%	-29%	51%	-31%

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 school's lowest performance in the 22-23 school year was 5th grade ELA (25% proficient) and 5th grade Science (25% proficient). Historically, this group of students' academic performance has been lower than other grade levels. For instance, in 21-22 the 4th grade ELA proficiency was 22%. However, when the students were in third and fourth grade, the state school grade model included gains and L25. In 22-23, we had a lot of student turnover from 4th to 5th grade where many students left the school as new students enrolled. Additionally, our fifth grade teachers' attendance was inconsistent throughout the school year due to various reasons.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline from the prior year was gains in ELA for our 3rd Grade Academy students (-58%). In 21-22, our Academy ELA Gains was 64% vs 6% in 22-23. We had a change in the teacher for the Academy class from one year to the next. Another difference is in the tier 2 intervention. In 21-22, the teacher facilitated small group guided reading. In 22-23, the teacher utilized the SRA Corrective Reading Program.

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.

In 22-23, the data component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average was 5th ELA proficiency.

5th Grade ELA Proficiency, 25%

State 5th Grade ELA Proficiency, 55%

Historically, this group of students' academic performance has been lower than other grade levels. For instance, in 21-22 the 4th grade ELA proficiency was 22%. However, when the students were in third and fourth grade, the state school grade model included gains and L25. In 22-23, we had a lot of student turnover from 4th to 5th grade where many students left the school as new students enrolled. Additionally, our fifth grade teachers' attendance was inconsistent throughout the school year due to various reasons.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was 4th Grade ELA Proficiency.

22-23 4th ELA Proficiency 50%

21-22 4th ELA Proficiency 38%

In 22-23, we moved 2 of our teachers to the 4th grade team and hired a teacher that had previously taught Middle School. In addition, we hired a paraprofessional that was a certified teacher and had ESE support from a highly effective ESE resource teacher. This team delivered consistent small group instruction and maximized all instructional time.

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

Two potential areas of concern are the number of students identified as level 1 on state assessments in ELA (72) and math (96) and the number of students that were absent 10% or more days (74).

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

1. Fifth grade math
2. Third Grade proficiency ELA
3. Fifth grade science
4. Positive Climate & Culture
5. ESSA SWD

Area of Focus

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

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.

One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Our 2022-2023 FOCUS data shows we met our goal of decreasing our aggression referrals by 10% as compared to 2021-2022 data (31 referrals of 70, 44%). In 2022-2023, we had a total of 34 referrals in which 11 were classified as aggression (32%). We want to look deeper into Tiered II/III intervention systems to implement and practice preventative strategies and build a more positive environment. Tier II: Interventions on a class basis, specialized instruction through character education aimed towards classrooms. Tier III: Interventions on an individual basis, specialized instruction catered to individual behavioral needs of the student. Analysis of social gains, school environment and referral data will be used to assess progress.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By end of the 2023-2024 school year, Ballard students will consistently demonstrate behaviors that reflect a respectful, responsible and safe school climate - Measurable through both disciplinary and positive behavior referrals. Demonstrating at least a 10% increase in positive behavior referrals as compared to the 2022-2023 school year (417 total) while maintaining the number of negative behavior referrals (34 total).

Monitoring:

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

Check-in, in class implementation of lifeskills in announcements and daily review. Student participation of House Systems, and progress monitoring through usage and assessments. Quarterly FOCUS data review, analyze need for support.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Victoria Adriano (adrianov@manateeschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Utilizing high yield, rapid response practices such as PBIS, the Ron Clark House System, restorative practices, daily check-ins and climate survey of students, has been proven to be effective strategies to address student behavior. Research shows that behavior improves when lifeskills strategies are practiced and implemented into curriculum consistently. Students have shown a positive trend in behavior when provided with multiple strategies to utilize in class or independently.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

These strategies are selected based on student data and need, indicating that students consistently struggle with appropriate decision-making and emotional well-being and handling.

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.

Classroom teachers in K-5 will incorporate lifeskills lessons into their instruction.

Person Responsible: Victoria Adriano (adrianov@manateeschools.net)

By When: Beginning in August 2023

Professional development will be centered around Growth Mindset and tiered intervention systems.

Person Responsible: Victoria Adriano (adrianov@manateeschools.net)

By When: Beginning in September 2023

PBIS and House System will be utilized schoolwide to increase student engagement, motivation and positive supports.

Person Responsible: Victoria Adriano (adrianov@manateeschools.net)

By When: Beginning in August 2023

Utilize taught de-escalation strategies (restorative practices, PBIS) to shape behavior.

Person Responsible: Victoria Adriano (adrianov@manateeschools.net)

By When: Ongoing

#2. 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.

According to our 2021-22 ESSA Subgroup Data Summary, the ESSA Subgroup SWD is at 30 for the Federal Percent of Points Index. This subgroup has been below 41% in ELA for 3 consecutive years and below 32% in ELA for 1 consecutive year.

Measurable Outcome:

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

If Tier I instruction is aligned to the rigor of the benchmarks, scaffolded to address individualized students' needs, and designed to increase accountability for learning among all students, then we will increase SWD proficiency, learning gains, and L25 to the percentages listed below as measured by 2024 Spring FAST. The aim is to effectively scaffold students' mastery of benchmarks while closing achievement gaps for non-proficient students. We will plan specifically for SWD students' growth by utilizing school and district staff to monitor, mentor, plan, and provide intense small group instruction through the plan, do, check, act system.

ELA Proficiency 40%

3rd Grade Reading Proficiency 40%

ELA learning gains 65%

L25 ELA 65%

Monitoring:

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

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

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Rudy Keezer (keezerr@manateeschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Florida's Multi-Tiered System of Support

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

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

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

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

Person Responsible: Rudy Keezer (keezerr@manateeschools.net)

By When: 9/2023-5/2024

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

Person Responsible: Mary Oliva (olivam@manateeschools.net)

By When: Beginning in August 2023

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

Person Responsible: Nancy Miller (millern@manateeschools.net)

By When: Beginning in August 2023

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

Person Responsible: Mary Oliva (olivam@manateeschools.net)

By When: Beginning in July 2023-ongoing

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

Person Responsible: Victoria Adriano (adrianov@manateeschools.net)

By When: Beginning in August-ongoing

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned Instruction**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.

One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

For the 2022-2023 school year, overall proficiency in grades 3-5 for each subject areas was as follows: ELA 36%, Math 45% and Science 25%. When analyzing this data by grade-level, we determined that the lowest proficiency percentages in every subject area was in 5th grade: ELA 25%, Math 30% and Science 25%. Conversely, our 3rd and 4th grade students made gains in proficiency for both ELA and Math when comparing 2021-2022 and 2022-2023 data. When setting goals for the 2023-2024 school year, we also considered our current 3rd graders performance on the PM3 STAR assessment from May 2023 (ELA 40% proficient, Math 49% proficient).

Measurable Outcome:

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

If Tier I instruction is aligned to the rigor of the benchmarks, scaffolded to address individualized students' needs, and designed to increase accountability for learning among all students, then we will increase proficiency, learning gains, and L25 to the percentages listed below as measured by 2024 Spring FAST. This expected proficiency and growth is applied to all students at each grade level and for each ESSA subgroup to meet or exceed 41% proficient. The aim is to effectively scaffold students' mastery of benchmarks while closing achievement gaps for non-proficient students.

ELA Proficiency 40%

3rd Grade Reading Proficiency 40%

Math Proficiency 50%

Science Proficiency 50%

ELA learning gains 65%

Math learning gains 65%

L25 ELA 65%

L25 Math 65%

55% B

Monitoring:

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

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

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Rudy Keezer (keezerr@manateeschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Florida's Multi-Tiered System of Support

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

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

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

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

Person Responsible: Rudy Keezer (keezerr@manateeschools.net)

By When: Beginning 9/2023-5/2024

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

Person Responsible: Mary Oliva (olivam@manateeschools.net)

By When: Beginning August 2023 and reviewed monthly at ILT

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

Person Responsible: Nancy Miller (millern@manateeschools.net)

By When: September 2023

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

Person Responsible: Mary Oliva (olivam@manateeschools.net)

By When: July 2023

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

Person Responsible: Victoria Adriano (adrianov@manateeschools.net)

By When: August 2023

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)).

We do not currently receive school improvement funding allocations. However, when we have in the past we elicited feedback from all stakeholders (surveys, parent meetings, staff meetings, team leaders, etc.). We considered our other funding sources and analyzed data. We presented our plan at our Student Advisory Council (SAC) meeting, and revised, when necessary.

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

Students in grades K-2 will receive direct and explicit instruction on the ELA B.E.S.T standards. Additional opportunities for targeted small group instruction and tiered interventions will be provided based on progress monitoring data. Teachers will integrate writing across all content areas to strengthen early literacy development and to ensure students' abilities to fully express ideas through reasoning, citing evidence, and problem solving.

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

Students in grades 3-5 will receive direct and explicit instruction on the ELA B.E.S.T standards. Additional opportunities for targeted small group instruction and tiered interventions will be provided based on progress monitoring data. Teachers will integrate writing across all content areas to strengthen early literacy development and to ensure students' abilities to fully express ideas through reasoning, citing evidence, and problem solving.

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

As measured by 2024 ELA Spring FAST, 40% or more of students in grades K-2 will earn a level 3 or higher.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

As measured by 2024 ELA Spring FAST, 40% or more of students in grades 3-5 will earn a level 3 or higher.

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.

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

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Keezer, Rudy, keezerr@manateeschools.net

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Facilitated, collaborative planning to increase teacher expertise of remedial and intervention instruction for small groups and opportunities for problem-solving, discussion of high-effect practices, and ongoing review of student performance data. Teachers will use Decision-Tree instructional materials, including Benchmark Advance, Lexia CORE, guided reading, SRA, and/or SIPPs, to ensure explicit and rigorous instruction for intervention.

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?

The purpose of planning, implementing, and monitoring responsive instruction is to ensure the progression of student learning and increase grade-level literacy proficiency. Effectively delivered core, remedial, and intervention instruction will move students along the trajectory toward proficiency. The Comprehensive Evidenced-based Reading Plan, Decision-Trees, and Literacy Leadership Teams will provide guidance on literacy intervention instruction.

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
All action steps for Benchmark-aligned Instruction also apply to the RAISE Area of Focus, specifically strengthening systems to monitor Tier 1 instruction and building teacher capacity through coaching for accelerated improvement.	Keezer, Rudy, keezerr@manateeschools.net
School teams will participate in and implement the professional development provided by the State Regional Literacy Directors to improve early literacy instruction. The instructional coach will participate in monthly coaches' academy aligned to the BSI Coaching for Accelerated Improvement.	Oliva, Mary, olivam@manateeschools.net

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.

At the Annual Title I Meeting, information is presented about the Title I program, the School Improvement Plan (SIP) as well as curriculum and academic assessments. Parents will learn about how to schedule parent-teacher conferences, and opportunities for participation in decisions related to the education of their children. We will also provide information that explains our curriculum, how parents can be involved in their child's education and how to have meaningful two-way communication. Information will also be posted on our school's website. Parents are provided opportunities to participate in the Annual Title I Meeting and regular SAC meetings to give input into the school's plan. Parents can provide input into the school plan and their comments will be recorded in the meeting minutes, which are submitted to the District's Federal Program Office. The school will keep parents informed of student progress through progress reports, report cards, assessment reports and informational letters. Parents also have access to student assessment data on the FOCUS Parent Portal. After the SIP is reviewed and approved at SAC, copies are made available to parents and it is posted on the school website.
<https://www.manateeschools.net/ballard>

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))

Staff welcome families at Open House before the school year begins. Families are invited to come to the school to meet their children's teachers and provide their preferred method of communication. We encourage families to sign up for ClassDojo on Open House night so that they can have two-way communication with the classroom teachers as well as the school. Based on prior parent survey results, we communicate with families via the Blackboard Mass Notification app (call/text/email/Facebook) and ClassDojo. State assessment information is made available for parents on the Focus Parent Portal. Staff send messages to families regarding checking Focus for report cards, test history, and progress reports. Students in intermediate grades also learn how to check their own Focus account. Our school website is <https://www.manateeschools.net/ballard>

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)

In order to accelerate learning in all academic areas, the main instructional focus will be targeted small group instruction for ELA and Math. We will analyze assessment data during TCTs and adjust groups and instruction accordingly. We will implement a Walk to Read model during Extended Hour and follow the District's Accelerated Math Curriculum. We will utilize all instructional staff to support small group learning. Teachers will participate in vertical grade-level planning.

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))

The school participates in the districts Soar In 4 program which offers parents of Pre-k, kindergarten and first grade students opportunities to participate in educational programs related to their student's curriculum and work at home with them on skills expected at school. This program is connected to community resources such as the Bishop Museum, Public Library and Art League. The school provides parents of ELL students information on the ESOL program and the supports it provides at two meetings per year. Information that is covered includes strategies for parents to use with their children at home to improve their educational experience. Imagine Learning program will be previewed to help parents understand how to use the program. The school connects families to needed dental and vision screening services as well as dental cleanings. These services are provided on campus through Manatee County Rural Health. Our Project Heart liaison connects with the district's Homeless Education Program, Project Heart for support and resources for students and families identified as homeless. We partner with Books for Kids, grades K-3. Readers are assigned to each classroom and read the book of the month. In addition, each classroom is provided with books for their libraries. One kindergarten class meets with reading mentors weekly to practice literacy activities identify as kindergarten benchmarks. We partner with School Attendance Support, Inc. They deliver items monthly, which are based on student need (i.e. hygiene products, uniforms, etc.).

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))

.

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))

.

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).

.

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))

.

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))

.

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: Positive Culture and Environment: Other	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Benchmark-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

No