

Manatee County Public Schools

Parrish Community 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	11
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	26
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Parrish Community High School

11601 ERIE RD, Parrish, FL 34219

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

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.

Parrish Community provides a safe and supportive environment, focused on academic excellence, social awareness, and community involvement while creating innovative learners who are inspired to meet local and global challenges.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Parrish Community's vision is to provide a safe and supportive environment where all stakeholders are respected and inspired. Students are driven to possess social awareness, civic responsibility, and aspire for personal growth. Working together with parents, families, and business partners Parrish Community is committed to using innovative technology and authentic pathways to drive college and career readiness to empower students as they develop into citizens in an ever-expanding global community.

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
Bradshaw, Daniel	Principal	Mr. Bradshaw oversees and coordinates instruction, academics, educational initiatives, administrative activities, and other happenings at the school site to ensure the school adheres to State and District policies and initiatives while upholding the mission and vision.
Champagne, Paul	Assistant Principal	Mr. Champagne assists the principal in any and all instructional, administrative, and operational leadership activities and is the coordinator of SAC.
Dohme, Ashley	Assistant Principal	Ms. Dohme assists the principal in any and all instructional, administrative, and operational leadership activities and is the coordinator of ESE / 504 plans.
Gagnon, Melissa	Assistant Principal	Mrs. Gagnon assists the principal in any and all instructional, administrative, and operational leadership activities and is the coordinator of the Instructional Leadership Team (ILT).
Ansbro, Diana	School Counselor	Mrs. Ansbro leads the school counselors in coordinating and implementing research-based practices for speaking with students and families.
Cummins, Anthony	Teacher, K-12	Mr. Cummins is the Reading Department Lead and Growth Mindset Professional Development Coordinator for the school.
Dietz, Heather	Teacher, K-12	Mrs. Dietz is the Math Department Lead and is actively involved in sponsors the Senior Class.
Grainger, Susan	Teacher, K-12	Ms. Grainger is the CTE Department lead.
Licata, Dana	Teacher, K-12	Mrs. Licata is the school's Testing Coordinator and helps analyze testing data.
Springer, Stephanie	Teacher, K-12	Ms. Springer is the English Language Arts (ELA) Department Lead.
Paternostro, Nicole	Dean	Ms. Paternostro is responsible for monitoring student behavior and addressing as needed.
Kennedy, Ryan	Teacher, ESE	Mr. Kennedy is the ESE Department Lead.

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.

Stakeholders are involved through our School Advisory Committee (SAC), which comprises school and district staff, teachers, parents, and students. SAC reviews and approves school improvement goals at a meeting in early fall. Additionally, music and athletic boosters are heavily involved in fundraising and advocacy in the community. Career and Technical Education (CTE) programs have advisory boards guiding program direction and decisions.

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))

Results and data from Progress Monitoring Tests, state assessments, quarterly grades, MTSS, and discipline will be routinely analyzed by the administration, Instructional Leadership Team (ILT), SAC, and CTE to ensure SIP goals are met. Should revision be necessary, it will be discussed in ILT and reviewed by SAC for approval.

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	35%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	34%
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: C
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

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

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	779	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	118	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	119	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	280	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	162	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	145

The number of students identified retained:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The number of students identified retained:

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

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

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

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

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	54	44	50	57	48	51	58		
ELA Learning Gains				52			49		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				42			36		
Math Achievement*	52	42	38	55	35	38	47		
Math Learning Gains				48			24		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				43			29		
Science Achievement*	70	64	64	58	45	40	70		
Social Studies Achievement*	65	59	66	68	43	48	68		
Middle School Acceleration					37	44			
Graduation Rate	93	84	89		63	61			
College and Career Acceleration	62	61	65		66	67			
ELP Progress	58	41	45	57			65		

** 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	65
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	454
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	93

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	53
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	480
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	98
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	40	Yes	2	
ELL	46			
AMI				
ASN	75			
BLK	48			
HSP	59			
MUL	59			
PAC				
WHT	69			

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	55			

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	32	Yes	1	
ELL	33	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN	81			
BLK	42			
HSP	47			
MUL	51			
PAC				
WHT	55			
FRL	47			

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	54			52			70	65		93	62	58
SWD	21			26			40	33		27	6	
ELL	20			29			53	29		40	7	58
AMI												
ASN	68			72			71	88			4	
BLK	35			23			42	31		60	6	
HSP	45			46			62	57		51	7	55
MUL	42			61			77	54			4	

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	58			55			75	70		65	6	
FRL	39			38			55	56		57	7	57

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	57	52	42	55	48	43	58	68				57
SWD	18	29	29	29	44	40	25	44				
ELL	29	33	38	24	32	25	23	40				57
AMI												
ASN	84	80		92	67		80	82				
BLK	37	46	50	25	35	50	19	74				
HSP	51	46	36	41	50	43	46	58				52
MUL	46	43	27	68	69		50					
PAC												
WHT	59	54	44	61	47	43	64	69				
FRL	44	43	38	43	53	53	41	59				52

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	58	49	36	47	24	29	70	68				65
SWD	25	29	21	28	13	8	26	47				
ELL	24	45	53	32	31		62					65
AMI												
ASN	71	68		88	7		88					
BLK	28	32	38	14	13		54	71				
HSP	55	51	34	41	25	30	62	58				65
MUL	45	55	40	50			71					
PAC												
WHT	60	49	36	50	26	31	72	68				
FRL	41	39	36	41	23	26	61	60				50

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	51%	44%	7%	50%	1%
09	2023 - Spring	57%	46%	11%	48%	9%

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	67%	56%	11%	48%	19%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	69%	64%	5%	63%	6%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	65%	58%	7%	63%	2%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

The lowest performing data component for SY22-23 was with ELA Lowest 25th Percentile at 42% proficient. This was a 6% improvement over the 36% achievement level in SY21-22. Proper identification of students, professional development, and collaborative planning contributed to the upturn in proficiency.

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

Social Studies achievement declined 4% from the prior year. In SY 22-23, 64% of students were proficient, while 68% were proficient in SY 21-22. There were personnel issues in the department. New staff was hired and there were restrictions on common planning time.

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.

The most significant gap between school and state data occurs in Algebra. 31% of Parrish students were proficient compared to a state average of 50%. Parrish scored 19% below the state average. The chief factor in this difference is the number of students who take Algebra in middle school and receive points in 8th grade. Disaggregating the data reveals a state proficiency rate of 83% for middle school students and 37% for high school. Although Parrish is slightly below the state average, it results from a more significant state-wide trend.

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

Math Learning Gains showed the most improvement, with 48% in SY22-23, climbing from 24% in SY21-22. This is an increase of 24%.

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

Not required for high schools per district memo.

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

1. Improve ELA Low Quartile
2. Improve Science Achievement
3. Countinue and build on improvements in Math Learning Gains and Low 25th Percentile.
4. Continue implementing Growth Mindset with students and staff.

Area of Focus

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

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**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.

We will focus on increasing the scores of our non-proficient students, including Students With Disabilities (SWD) and English Language Learners (ELL).

SWDs receive interventions through classroom accommodations, push-in support facilitation in core classes, and learning strategies classes. Accommodations are determined during IEP meetings and support students who are performing well but still need a few accommodations with regular coursework. Support facilitation is used with students who maintain most of their grades but still need extra assistance in the classroom. Learning Strategies offers the most intensive support for SWDs who are behind in several courses and need additional organizational and study strategies.

ELLs receive support through multiple avenues as well. ELLs with an ACCESS score below 1.9 are enrolled in English through ESOL. These students receive help with other courses from a certified ESOL teacher. Students scoring below 2.8 are placed in an English Language Development classroom where they receive additional support, similar to learning strategies. Senior ELLs who have met graduation requirements and are not following an alternative pathway are placed in intensive reading.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By the end of the 2023-24 school year, 58% of tested students will demonstrate proficiency on the FAST ELA test (level 3 or above), 55% of students will demonstrate learning gains, and 44% of lowest quartile students will show learning gains.

Monitoring:

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

Using the district-adopted textbook, "StudySync," curriculum maps, and aligned with BEST standards, teachers will instruct students in English Language Arts (ELA). Following Progress Monitoring 1 (PM1), 9th and 10th grade ELA teachers will review test data. Each grade-level team will identify areas for reteaching before Progress Monitoring 2 (PM2).

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Stephanie Springer (springers@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.)

Teachers will use the Florida Assessment for Student Thinking (FAST) to monitor student growth using PM1 and PM2. Evidence-based strategies in StudySync and Lexia PowerUp for Intensive Reading classes include:

- *Vocabulary building.
- *Collaborative discussion.
- *High-order critical thinking skills.
- *Prompts.
- *Short/long response questions.
- *Extended oral / writing projects for ELL.

Data meetings will be held following Progress Monitoring exams. Teachers will break down their data and identify areas that need to be revisited with all students, including SWD and ELL. They will also review the

scope and sequence and collaboratively plan upcoming lessons.

An ELA boot camp will occur in the spring before testing. Students will receive additional instruction on standards that are weighed heavily on the exam and be shown test-taking skills.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Monitoring our SWD and ELL students will be critical to gaining proficiency this year. With combined district resources, administrative coaching, and high-caliber teaching, we should achieve our proficiency projections.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**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.

Although our math proficiency rates are slightly above the state and district, we will continue to improve by raising achievement across the board, including our SWD and ELL population.

SWDs receive interventions through classroom accommodations, push-in support facilitation in core classes, and learning strategies classes. Accommodations are determined during IEP meetings and support students who are performing well but still need a few accommodations with regular coursework. Support facilitation is used with students who maintain most of their grades but still need extra assistance in the classroom. Learning Strategies offers the most intensive support for SWDs who are behind in several courses and need additional organizational and study strategies.

ELLs receive support through multiple avenues as well. ELLs with an ACCESS score below 1.9 are enrolled in English through ESOL. These students receive help with other courses from a certified ESOL teacher. Students scoring below 2.8 are placed in an English Language Development classroom where they receive additional support, similar to learning strategies.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By the end of the 2023-24 school year, 58% of students will achieve proficiency (level 3 or above) on their math EOC exam., 55% of students will demonstrate learning gains, and 44% of low-quartile students will show learning gains.

Monitoring:

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

Monitoring will include quarter/semester benchmark testing, progress grades, FAST / EOC testing, and implementation of ESE and ESOL accommodations.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Heather Dietz (dietzh@manateeschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

We will use the district-approved standards-based curriculum materials. ALEKS will provide additional support for MTSS Tier 2 and Tier 3 students. All classes will use the BEST Mathematical Thinking and Reasoning Skills (MTRS). There will be a heavy emphasis on utilizing the BG1-M for planning and differentiation.

Data meetings will be held following exams. Teachers will break down their data and identify areas that need to be revisited with all students, including SWD and ELL. They will also review the scope and sequence and collaboratively plan upcoming lessons.

An ELA boot camp will occur in the spring before testing. Students will receive additional instruction on standards that are weighed heavily on the exam and be shown test-taking skills.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

With the BEST standards and MRTS, we will monitor the progress of math students. The FDOE B1G-M instructional guides and FAST blueprints should help more students reach proficiency.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

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

Parrish Community saw an increase of 11% in science proficiency last year. Although this puts us above the district and state average, we will continue improving proficiency for all students on the Biology EOC, emphasizing our SWD and ELL students.

SWDs receive interventions through classroom accommodations, push-in support facilitation in core classes, and learning strategies classes. Accommodations are determined during IEP meetings and support students who are performing well but still need a few accommodations with regular coursework. Support facilitation is used with students who maintain most of their grades but still need extra assistance in the classroom. Learning Strategies offers the most intensive support for SWDs who are behind in several courses and need additional organizational and study strategies.

ELLs receive support through multiple avenues as well. ELLs with an ACCESS score below 1.9 are enrolled in English through ESOL. These students receive help with other courses from a certified ESOL teacher. Students scoring below 2.8 are placed in an English Language Development classroom where they receive additional support, similar to learning strategies.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By the end of the 2023-2024 school year, 72% of students taking the Biology End of Course Exam (EOC) will achieve proficient scores (level 3 or above).

Monitoring:

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

Students will continue to track their pre- and post-knowledge checks throughout the school year and refer back to what to study. This will give insight into success on standards. Teachers will plan collaboratively and create needs-based interventions.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Daniel Waltemate (waltemated@manateeschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

The science department will implement the district/state-provided curriculum standards in conjunction with support for Tier 2 and 3 learners through HMH Dimensions, Gizmos, lab activities, and Progress Learning. Strategies include explorations, analysis, application, and explanation. Problem-solving investigations will enable students to state claims, gather evidence, and explain reasoning.

Data meetings will be held following exams. Teachers will break down their data and identify areas that need to be revisited with all students, including SWD and ELL. They will also review the scope and sequence and collaboratively plan upcoming lessons.

An ELA boot camp will occur in the spring before testing. Students will receive additional instruction on standards that are weighed heavily on the exam and be shown test-taking skills.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The district curriculum maps, scope, and sequence will support standards-based learning for proficiency on the Biology EOC.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Social Studies**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.

Although our Social Studies proficiency scores dropped some points, Parrish Community remains slightly above the district and state proficiency rates. We will continue building on our proficiency numbers, with an emphasis on SWD and ELL students.

SWDs receive interventions through classroom accommodations, push-in support facilitation in core classes, and learning strategies classes. Accommodations are determined during IEP meetings and support students who are performing well but still need a few accommodations with regular coursework. Support facilitation is used with students who maintain most of their grades but still need extra assistance in the classroom. Learning Strategies offers the most intensive support for SWDs who are behind in several courses and need additional organizational and study strategies.

ELLs receive support through multiple avenues as well. ELLs with an ACCESS score below 1.9 are enrolled in English through ESOL. These students receive help with other courses from a certified ESOL teacher. Students scoring below 2.8 are placed in an English Language Development classroom where they receive additional support, similar to learning strategies. Senior ELLs who have met graduation requirements and are not following an alternative pathway are placed in intensive reading.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By the end of the 2023-2024 school year, 72% of students taking the US History of End of Course Exam (EOC) will achieve proficient scores (level 3 or above).

Monitoring:

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

District Benchmark Data and classroom assessments will be analyzed for trends through PM1 and PM2. Data meetings with US History teachers will identify standards for re-teaching.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Paul Champagne (champagp@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.)

Standards-based district/state-adopted curriculum will be used with additional Tier 2 and 3 support through McGraw Hill Textbook and Gateway to US History for test prep.

Data meetings will be held following benchmark tests. Teachers will be able to break down their data and identify areas that need to be revisited with all students, including SWD and ELL. They will also review the scope and sequence for the next quarter and collaboratively plan upcoming lessons.

A US History boot camp will occur in the spring before testing. Students will receive additional instruction on standards that are weighed heavily on the exam and be shown test-taking skills.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Implementing district curriculum maps, scope, and sequence will support standards-based learning for student proficiency on the EOC exam.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#5. 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.

Growth Mindset has been a cornerstone of school culture at Parrish Community. It permeates everything we do, especially with our SWD and ELL students. This year, we are focusing on individual students and their ability to succeed.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By the end of the 2023-24 school year, all PCHS students will engage in ten Resiliency lessons, including Cooperation, Responsibility, Respect, Patriotism, Gratitude, Empathy, Perseverance, Honesty, Courage, and Creativity.

Monitoring:

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

Classroom teachers will administer resiliency lessons monthly per the district's plan.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Paul Champagne (champagg@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.)

All students, including SWD and ELL students, will benefit from Resiliency's emphasis on character traits that allow success in school and personal life.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Positive culture begins with individual students and their success in the classroom. The Resiliency program will give students the skills needed to be successful and develop practical strategies for maintaining a growth mindset.

The SAC and Booster clubs meet regularly with all stakeholders to develop initiatives that improve the school. Professional Development (PD), ILT, and MTSS / IST meetings promote teacher feedback and parent input to support students. Key Club provides community service activities in the community and school.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

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)).

State funds are not provided to assist ATSI schools. However, local funds are provided to schools based on PPA in Manatee County School District (Mission Critical). These funds can be used and will be used to address areas of focus to support Federal Index Groups that are performing below 41% proficiency. Once schools are given an allocation, the school leadership team, in collaboration with the Executive Directors of Elementary and Secondary, reviews plans and ensures resources are used appropriately.